DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 655 95 SP 009 282

AUTHOR Soper, Dorothy B.
TITLE ESEA, Title III Dissemination Program Evaluation Report, 1972-73, 1973-74. Sections I and II.
INSTITUTION New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. Div. of Research, Planning, and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 133p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Educational Administration; Educational Programs; *Information Dissemination; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Projects; *School Districts; *State Departments of Education; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the New Jersey ESEA Title III dissemination program during its first two years, 1972-74. Purposes of the program are to (a) determine if essential elements of successful education programs can be transferred from originating districts to adopter districts while yielding comparable student gains, and (b) provide educators with a way to meet local education needs by adopting or adapting one or more elements of these successful programs. Section one focuses on policy and procedures for program selection and dissemination. Dissemination is discussed in terms of: (a) producer-consumer agreements, (b) program staffing, (c) timing, (d) publishers, (e) incentive grants for adopter districts, (f) role of project staff as trainers, (g) publicity, (h) transfer of programs among districts, and (i) long-term dissemination. Program impact is summarized. Section two includes summary reports of the following 10 programs selected for dissemination by the Office of Program Development: (a) Dale Avenue Project, (b) Educational Services for Schoolage Parents, (c) Individualized Language Arts: Diagnosis, Prescription, and Evaluation, (d) Interning for Learning, (e) Learning Center: Integrated Alternative to Special Education (f) Project LEM: Learning Experience Module, (g) MOPPET: Media Oriented Program Promoting Exploration in Teaching, (h) Project: Open Classroom, (i) Pollution Control Education Center, (j) Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, and (k) Project SEE: Specific Education of the Eye. (JS)

ED107655

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ESEA, Title III Dissemination Program

Evaluation Report, 1972-73, 1973-74

Section I

Office of Program Development
Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Department of Education
State of New Jersey

February, 1975

Prepared by Dorothy B. Soper

SP009 283

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION I: Narrative Summary	
Transferability	3
OPD Dissemination Policy: Selection of Programs for Dissemination	5
OPD Dissemination Procedures:	10
Producer-Consumer Agreements	10
Staffing of dissemination Programs	11
Timing of dissemination	12
Publishers	12
Incentive grants for adopter districts	13
The role of project staff as trainers	13
Publicity	14
The transfer of programs among districts: Urban, Suburban, and Rural	16
Long-term dissemination	17
Educational Needs of Local Districts	19
Conclusions and Summary of Program Dissemination Impact	19
SECTION II: Summary Reports of Dissemination Activities	22
Office of Program Development	23
Dale Avenue Project	27
Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	39
Individualized Language Arts	48
Interning for Learning	57
Learning Center	72
LEM	74
MOPPET	89
Open Classroom	99
Pollution Control Education Center	106
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	109
SEE	116

INTRODUCTION

Section I of this report summarizes the impact of the New Jersey ESEA, Title III dissemination program during the first two years of its operation, 1972-73 and 1973-74. Projections are made for the cumulative impact by August, 1975 for those programs whose dissemination began in one of the years under consideration. The purposes of the dissemination program are to:

a. determine whether the essential elements of a successful educational program can be transferred from the originating district(s) to adopter districts while yielding comparable student gains.

b. provide New Jersey educators with the opportunity to meet local educational needs by adopting or adapting one or more elements of these successful educational programs.

The first purpose reflects the fact that this dissemination program is part of a total program development process whose components are design, field testing, and dissemination. With respect to this purpose the evaluation will help us improve dissemination policies and procedures as well as modify the design process to increase the transferability of educational practices.

The second purpose reflects the fact that through the short term dissemination of a program we can help local districts meet their educational needs. If the short term demand for a practice is substantial, we can as a Department of Education consider fostering its long term dissemination through a unified departmental dissemination capability.

At the outset it should be noted that our data must be considered preliminary in three senses. First, 1972-73 and 1973-74 were the first two years of the dissemination program and thus represent a time when we had limited experience and few precedents to guide us. Second, most of the programs disseminated were for the elementary grades. Thus the relevance of this information for programs for the higher grades is uncertain. Finally, our target audience was New Jersey educators. In the current year, 1974-75, several projects are beginning to work with educators in other states. We have limited information based on this experience, but so far it is consistent with the New Jersey experience. However, it is too early to draw any conclusions about national dissemination beyond that provided by a commercial publisher. Despite these limitations our data give us a sound basis for evaluating the direction of the dissemination program.

This report is written so that we may draw conclusions about progress toward the achievement of the two goals of dissemination, the way OPD dissemination policies and procedures have contributed to this progress, and how these policies and procedures might be modified to contribute more significantly to the achievement of the goals. Data on the achievement of the transferability goal is discussed first; a discussion of dissemination policies and procedures follows; then the data on the goal of assisting educators to meet local needs are presented. While recommendations on policy and procedure are made throughout the report, the final section, Conclusions, summarizes them.

The data upon which this report is based are taken primarily from the evaluation reports for dissemination plans submitted in 1972-73 and 1973-74 by the project directors. These data are summarized in Section II. In addition the summaries and conclusions reflect the personal observations of OPD staff and their conversations with the project staff and New Jersey educators who have participated in various dissemination activities.

An effort was made to double check these data with the project directors who were asked to review the first drafts of the summaries for their projects and in some cases provide additional information. But it was not possible to provide the project directors with an opportunity to review the final draft of this report. Therefore any errors contained herein are the responsibility of the author.

The evaluation reports of the individual projects provide much additional information concerning project dissemination. They are available to interested persons upon request.

TRANSFERABILITY

When the dissemination program began in 1972 the staff of the Office of Program Development selected ten projects in their second and third years of field testing to take part. These projects were chosen because they had improved students' cognitive and/or affective behavior at a statistically significant level. The projects were:

Project	Year of Field Testing (1972-73)
Dale Avenue Project	3
Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	completed
Individualized Language Arts	3
Interning for Learning	2
Learncycle	completed
LEM	completed
MOPPET	3
Pollution Control Education Center	3
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	completed
SEE	2

Eight of these projects carried out Title III funded dissemination activities in 1972-73 of which some were quite limited due to the ongoing field test responsibilities of the staff. In mid-1972 the staff of the Pollution Control Education Center successfully negotiated a contract with a commercial publisher to publish their curriculum materials. No dissemination activities were undertaken by the Learncycle staff due to the scope of new responsibilities. That staff is, however, looking for a commercial publisher for the program materials.

In early 1973 the national ESEA, Title III validation procedure was established. All of the projects listed above plus Learning Center and Open Classroom, both in their second field test year, took part and were validated as innovative, successful, cost-effective, and exportable. In 1973 the staff of OPD decided that validation through this process would be required for a project to be considered for statewide dissemination. In 1973-74 all of the New Jersey validated programs had Title III funded dissemination plans with the exception of Learncycle and the Pollution Control Education Center.

It is important to point out that in 1972-73 and 1973-74 all eligible programs were encouraged to carry out dissemination activities. No attempt to select among the programs for dissemination was made. In fact two like programs (mainstreaming of special education students) were supported for dissemination in one year, 1973-74.

Evidence of the extent of program transfer from originating sites to adopter districts has been submitted to OPD by project directors in two ways: summaries of evaluation questionnaires filled out by adopter districts and/or sales figures for program materials. When evaluation questionnaires are the information source, a program transfer is defined as an adopter district's replication of most or all of a validated program's essential components that are responsible for the program's impact on students. In some cases these data were verified by consultation visits of project staff. In most cases they were not. When sales figures were used to determine extent of transfer it was because the materials' use constituted program transfer and the assumption that the materials were self explanatory.

The ten programs which had Title III funded dissemination plans in 1972-73 and 1973-74 report for these years a total of 1,110 persons trained, 251 adopter districts, and 28,541 children included in adoptions or adaptations of the programs. Their projections for dissemination impact through August, 1975 suggest that these totals will reach 2,280 persons trained, 841 adopter districts, and 68,471 students. Sales of the commercially distributed program reached $36,000 in June, 1974. It is estimated that these materials will be used to instruct 30,000 students and that additional sales in 1974-75 will bring total student involvement to 45,000.*

While these data must be considered preliminary they indicate that the transfer of successful educational programs from originating to adopter districts has occurred. As of September, 1974 approximately 37% of the public school districts in New Jersey and 2% of the state's students had been or currently were involved in the adoption or adaptation of one of ten validated educational programs. These figures will be slightly higher if we include New Jersey districts and students using Pollution Control Education materials but we do not have New Jersey figures for those materials separate from the totals.

In response to the questionnaires distributed by project directors, most adopter districts have indicated that they will continue and often expand the program in question. But at this point we need better information on the extent to which these transfers are sustained beyond their first year and the manner in which districts adapt program elements to the specific requirements of their situation as the transfers become institutionalized. To gain this information in the current year, 1974-75, most project directors will send evaluation questionnaires to districts whose staffs were trained in 1972-73 and 1973-74. Most project directors will also verify program transfers by visits to the adopter districts.

We have evidence that students in adopting districts achieved gains comparable to those of students in an originating district in only one project, SEE. These data were obtained by the voluntary cooperation of twelve consumer districts during 1972-73 and 1973-74 and represent the testing of 1,965 students. They show that of the students that received the recommended seven months of instruction 73% made gains comparable to those of the originating district. Preschool students in a consumer district also made gains but since preschool students are not included in the program in the originating district, these scores cannot be compared to those of the originating district.

* These figures are summarized on page 21. Section II contains a more detailed summary of each program's dissemination impact.

For the Dale Avenue Project we have evidence that the students in the urban consumer district which began the program in 1973-74 made gains measured against a control group in the adopting district. On some but not all of the tests used consumer district students were achieving at a level comparable to that of students in the originating district. These data were gained through the provisions of an ESEA, Title III grant awarded to the adopter district.

We have reported student gains for which documentation has been requested in one adopting district for LEM and one for Interning for Learning. These data were yielded by local district testing programs.

In the current year, 1974-75, we anticipate gaining additional information on student impact through twenty-three ESEA, Title III grants made to districts replicating one of these programs whose staff will submit student evaluation data on the impact of the replications. Three additional grants were made to school districts working in cooperation with County Superintendent's Offices to disseminate and evaluate program transfer on a countrywide basis. These new data will help us understand further the potential impact of the dissemination of successful educational programs.

On the basis of the data we now have on student results in adopter districts and the experience of the OPD staff in working with consumer districts in the design of their ESEA, Title III consumer proposals, we can say that the measure of comparability of student results is a complex task. First, it requires a comparability of student need in originator and adopter districts. Therefore not all adopter districts can supply the best kind of data. Second, it requires the validated program to be clearly delineated and highly specific in a description of its use and in the training program to prepare consumers for its use. Without this one cannot judge whether the program adopted is responsible for a change in student performance. At this time some of the validated programs have not met these criteria. We can see, too, that this level of specificity, a commitment to adopt a program in toto by a consumer district, and satisfactory program implementation -- all of which are necessary for a measure of the comparability of student results -- become more difficult to obtain as program complexity increases. For highly complex programs one year of use by an adopter may be insufficient to determine student results since the time required for staff readiness and program implementation may be most of the first year of adoption. This means that additional project and OPD resources may have to be invested in this type of evaluation effort.

Despite these difficulties we still believe that measures of the comparability of student performance between an originating district and a representative sample of adopter districts should be taken for all programs disseminated by OPD because without this kind of information we cannot provide New Jersey educators with educational programs alternatives that warrant the Department's recommendation of the expenditure of staff time and district funds in anticipation of favorable student impact. And finally, without this kind of information, we cannot continue to improve the total program development process to produce transferable educational programs.

dissemination is or should be limited to districts of student need comparable to that of originating districts or that many types of districts cannot benefit from using limited aspects of these programs. Indeed our dissemination procedures provide many opportunities for New Jersey educators to obtain all program materials, visit the demonstration sites, and attend introductory training workshops without making any commitment to program use. The scope of dissemination impact at this level will be discussed later. But we do wish to underscore at this time that our ultimate aim is to improve student outcomes and that in order to recommend programs which can do this we need evidence of total program impact in adopter districts.

OPD DISSEMINATION POLICY:

Selection of Programs for Dissemination

We have seen that in 1972-73 and 1973-74 the OPD staff offered all validated programs the opportunity to develop dissemination plans to the full scope that could be supported by the project staff. On the basis of the evaluation of the dissemination of eleven different programs we can identify program variables that contribute to transferability. We suggest that these variables, in addition to others which will be discussed in subsequent sections of this report, be used as guidelines to determine the scope of the dissemination undertaken, with Title III funds, for any program. The scope should also reflect the relative importance of the educational need which the program addresses.

For this discussion the programs are catagorized on the following pages according to the program variables that seem to be the most important in determining program transferability. A discussion of each variable follows the charts.

Content and Focus

[Curriculum]	[Management]	[Combination of Curriculum and Management]
Individualized Language Arts (ILA)	Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	Dale Avenue Project
MOPPET	Learning Center (LC)	Interning for Learning
Pollution Control Education units	LEM	Open Classroom
SEE	Prescriptive Teaching Workshop (PTW)	

[Basic Skills]	[Affective Domaine]
Dale Avenue Project	Educational Services for Schoolage Parents
ILA	
LC	Interning
LEM	MOPPET
Pollution Control units	Open Classroom
PTW	
SEE	

Availability of written materials required for program adoption in 1972-73 and/or 1973-74

Yes	When	No
Dale Avenue Project	Latter part of 1973-74	Learning Center (manual printed, summer, 1974)
Ed. Services for Schoolage Parents	January, 1974	
Individualized Language Arts	1972-73 / 1973-74	Open Classroom (some curriculum and teacher's materials, winter, 1974)
Interning for Learning	1973-74	
LEM	Latter part of 1972-73	
Pollution Control	published as ready 1973, 1974	
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	1972-73, 1973-74	
SEE	Level I, 1972-73 Level II, 1973-74 Tactuals, 1973-74	

Extent of change required in staffing roles and/or responsibilities for a typical school or district

Low	High
Individualized Language Arts	Dale Avenue Project
Interning for Learning	Educational Services for Schoolage Parents
MOPPET	Learning Center
Pollution Control units	LEM
SEE	Open Classroom
	Prescriptive Teaching Workshop

Cost of program adoption

[Training Time]

Little or none	3-5 meetings / 5-40 hours	More than 5 meetings and forty hours
Pollution Control units	Dale Avenue Project	
SEE	Ed. Svcs. for Schoolage Parents	Open Classroom
	Individualized Language Arts	
	Interning for Learning	
	Learning Center	
	LEM - MOPPET	
	Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	

[Materials and/or equipment required for adoption]

$20 or less per 25 students	Approximately $50 - $200 per 25 students	$200 or more per 25 students
Individualized Language Arts SEE	Dale Avenue Project Interning for Learning LEM MOPPET Open Classroom Pollution Control units	Ed. Svcs. for Schoolage Parents Learning Center Prescriptive Teaching Workshop

(Note: All of the above projects are in special education, thus their costs are 50% reimburseable from the state.)

Written materials

The single most important variable seems to be the availability of written materials to articulate the program. This has been assessed in two ways. First, the dissemination of projects which have had plans for two years increased significantly after the written materials became available. Second, the dissemination of the eight programs that had most or all of their materials available was decidedly greater than that of the programs that had few or none of their materials available.

A function of the existance of project materials is the definition of the project itself, that is the identification of a project's components which are responsible for its impact on students. It has been our experience that if written materials are not available the project either is or appears to be ill defined to potential users. This inhibits program transfer because it requires too much time and effort for potential users to learn about the program, and, if interested, to replicate it.

Change in staff roles and/or responsibilities

A second important variable seems to be the extent to which adoption or adaptation requires a change in staff roles and/or responsibilities for the typical school or district. The five programs that require relatively little change are among those widely disseminated. Of the six which require relatively extensive change, one has been widely adopted and a second moderately so. The remaining four have had limited dissemination. That which the latter did receive is largely attributable to the awarding of ESEA, Title III consumer grants. This suggests that a program's transferability is enhanced if it requires a relatively limited change in staff roles and/or responsibilities. We should also note that if relatively great change is required by a project, the project staff should suggest a phase-in program for the change. Also there must be an adequate amount of training and consultation time available from the project staff to adopter districts to support the change required. This should contribute to the transferability of a program which requires a relatively extensive change in staff roles and/or responsibilities.

Adoption Cost

A third important variable is start-up cost of transfer which is estimated in two ways: the cost of freeing staff to be trained, and that of materials and equipment. Ten of the eleven programs require five meetings (forty hours) or less of training time. There is no evidence that the cost of training time up to this level has inhibited dissemination since one of the most widely disseminated projects required five days (forty hours) of training. The extended training period of the eleventh project may have limited its dissemination.

The staff developed materials of most programs cost less than $40 per classroom. Those of the Pollution Control program cost between $90 and $125 per classroom. In addition to these materials, user districts often purchase supplies for teachers to make their own materials, additional manipulative materials for general classroom use, and often small pieces of equipment for children to use independently such as tape recorders, overhead projectors, etc. There is no evidence that start-up costs of this type, below $200 per classroom, limit dissemination. Of course the cost must be proportionate to the scope of the project. To the best of our knowledge maintenance costs for these projects, in additional materials and equipment, can be met through a district's reallocation of regular budget items.

The limited dissemination of projects whose adoption costs exceed $200 per 25 students suggests that the cost factor has inhibited dissemination.

If new staff must be hired for a district to adopt one of these programs this, of course, becomes a significant adoption cost. At the present time the staffing requirements of all but one of the programs being disseminated seem to be common enough in New Jersey so that program transfer has not meant the hiring of new staff. It is probably true, although it cannot be verified at this time, that adopter districts have staff configurations similar to those of the originating districts. We can say, for instance, that most of the adopters of the Dale Avenue Project provide two hours of aide time per teacher per day following the pattern of the originating district. It is probably the case that the relatively limited dissemination of Educational Services for Schoolage Parents is in part due to the specialized staffing that it requires and the fact that few districts now have these staffing arrangements.

Two projects, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop and Individualized Language Arts, reported at the conclusion of their field test periods that they had reduced district expenditures as a result of their success. To date we have no evidence that adoption of any project has reduced district expenditures. It is probably too early to see this for either of the two noted above or for others that may do this through decreasing the need for remedial instruction. Reduction of district expenditures in real dollars is, however, an outcome that may logically be expected from the dissemination effort.

Content and Focus

A fourth important variable is program content and focus. To assess this variable we have organized the programs in two ways: first, according to their focus in curriculum and/or management or both, and second, according to whether they address basic skills or the affective domaine. It should be noted that some of the programs in the basic skills areas do have data to show student growth in the affective domaine, but the reverse is not true. The Pollution Control program is classified in the basic skills area because it is designed to be integrated into a school's science or social studies curriculum.

The three programs that address only curriculum in the basic skills areas are widely disseminated. Two programs that address basic skills but also include a management component, Dale Avenue and LEM, were moderately disseminated. One management program that addresses the affective domaine, Interning for Learning, is widely seen as important for basic skills because its management system addresses the basic skills areas. As we have seen, it is widely disseminated. The two management programs that address basic skills for special education students have had limited dissemination. This seems to be the result of the fact that they address a smaller population and are relatively expensive.

Of the four programs that address the affective domaine, only one is limited to curriculum and it is widely disseminated. We have seen that Interning is widely disseminated but that it is perceived as having a broader impact to users. Of the two remaining programs that address the affective domaine, the dissemination of one, Open Classroom, may have been limited because it did not address cognitive skills. It is probably for that reason that its current emphasis is in the development of curriculum materials in basic skills. The remaining program that addresses the affective domaine is highly specialized and expensive to staff. Therefore, several variables seem to account for its limited dissemination.

From these data we can see that educators seem to be more interested in programs in the basic skills area than those whose impact is solely in the affective domaine. But we can also see that the influence of this variable is understandable only in terms of the others that have already been discussed.

OPD DISSEMINATION PROCEDURES

The results of the first two years of dissemination demonstrated the general validity of the dissemination procedures as described in Pathways to Success. This is not surprising since the procedures were developed pragmatically on the basis of our month to month experience during the first two years. Several aspects of the application of these procedures are understood better now, however, and should be discussed separately.

Producer-Consumer Agreements

Most project directors have found increasing evidence of the need for solid administrative support at the level of building principal to secure adequate program transfer and continuation of an adoption beyond the first year. This is necessary for teachers to receive ongoing encouragement, supervision, and in some cases planning time. This is also required to provide for the orientation of new staff and turn-key training programs for the adoption to be expanded within a school or district. It is probably true, although it cannot be verified at this time, that most of the attrition between training and implementation in the dissemination process is due to lack of administrative support for the project in the consumer district.

As a result the function of the Producer-Consumer Agreement to provide written evidence of administrative support and a plan for program implementation as a prerequisite for complete program training has become increasingly important. We recommend the continuation of the use of these agreements and their refinement so that they increasingly serve as evidence of the state of readiness that a potential adopter district should achieve for a program transfer to succeed. This conclusion does not apply, it should be pointed out, to programs which require little or no training for dissemination unless their systematic use

on a school or district wide basis is sought by the adopter district.

Staffing of dissemination programs

The staffing of most projects for dissemination has resembled that of the field test period. In most projects, the field test staff had other responsibilities in the district and thus did not devote full time to the project during this period. This situation increases the likelihood that a project will be continued by a local district since continuation will not be an obligation to increase staff. In this sense it contributes to successful dissemination. This situation means, however, that if dissemination begins during the field test period, staff time available for it is usually extremely limited. Further, that available even after the field test period is often less than one full time equivalent. Staffing levels for 1972-73 and 1973-74 are summarized below by full time equivalent:

Project	1972-73	1973-74
Dale Avenue Project	.3	4
Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	.1	.1
Individualized Language Arts	.3	.3
Interning for Learning	.6	4
Learning Center	--	two weeks only
LEM	.3	.3
MOPPET	.2	1
Open Classroom	--	.4
Pollution Control	five days	five days
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	.2	.2
SEE	.2	1

Of the eight projects which began Title III funded dissemination in 1972-73 only three had concluded their field test period. Both of the projects that began dissemination in 1973-74 were in their field test period. In most cases project directors found that it was exceedingly difficult to combine both field test and dissemination responsibilities. One reason for this strain was that most projects did not have written materials prepared and thus the staff either had to write them and/or compensate for their absence by spending a large amount of time explaining the project to potential users. As a result of this experience we recommend that no project begin dissemination prior to the completion of the field test period unless adequate staff time is available.

The post field test dissemination of four projects (LEM, Individualized Language Arts, Educational Services for Schoolage Parents, and Prescriptive Teaching Workshop) has probably been limited by the relatively small amount of staff time available. We should point out that in each case the support of dissemination activities has been a demanding burden that these staffs willingly accepted. In the future we should consider carefully whether the dissemination of projects with limited staff time available might be undertaken by agencies other than the originating district. Such possibilities include not only commercial publishers but also the Department of Education.

Timing of dissemination

The question of the timing of dissemination is an extension of the discussion on staffing. We have seen that effective dissemination requires not only adequate staffing but also adequate written materials. For this reason we recommend that no publicity be released about a project's dissemination potential until the written materials are prepared and available for examination by interested parties.

In most cases our recommendations on the staffing and timing of dissemination will mean that a project will not be disseminated during the field test period. In some cases, perhaps over half, it will mean that a year beyond the field test period will be required for the preparation of materials before dissemination can begin. The frequency of this time lag may be reduced if project staffs are encouraged to prepare (and field test) project materials during the field test period.

Publishers

For the years discussed the materials of one program were distributed by a commercial publisher. They are the most widely distributed of those of any N.J. validated program, thus clearly illustrating the importance of this dissemination channel. It is also important to note that this channel provides a longterm dissemination source that does not require the investment of public funds. The materials' price was set by the publisher in consultation with the local Board of Education and OPD. Every effort was made to offer the materials at a fair price so that they would be widely used. Even though the project staff has pointed out that the price seems to be high enough to impede the materials' sale, we should note that this is overcome to some extent by the firm's marketing capabilities. While this program's materials are more expensive than those distributed by the projects at cost, they are far more widely distributed than those of any other project.

At the end of 1973-74 several projects had prepared materials which were judged by the project and OPD staff worthy of publication. By that time the dissemination efforts had yielded a demand profile for the projects which should be of interest to publishers. At this time, however, none of these projects has yet located a publisher. Staff time allowing, the effort to locate publishers should be reenforced to a greater extent by OPD staff work. Projects whose staffs are seeking publishers, either non-profit or commercial are:

Dale Avenue Project
Individualized Language Arts
Learncycle
MOPPET
Open Classroom

Incentive grants for adopter districts

It was OPD's policy in 1972-73 and 1973-74 not to award funds directly to districts adopting one of the validated programs. Adopter districts were responsible for assuming all costs which their staffs incurred to adopt the programs (but there of course was no charge for the services of the project staffs). The one exception to this policy was the Title III grant awarded to Stokes School in Trenton for its replication of the Dale Avenue Project. This was made on a trial basis to gain student impact data. The Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, New Jersey Department of Education, however, did award five small grants for a total of $ 28,000 to adopter districts of LEM and Interning for Learning. The basis of these awards was financial need and the contribution of these adoptions to the districts' integration plans.

The decision of the OPD staff to award ESEA, Title III grants to districts that wished to adopt one of the validated projects in 1974-75 was not made to foster dissemination per se even though it did so. The purpose of the consumer grants is to secure data on the impact of these programs on students in the adopter districts.

In conclusion we can say that small incentive grants do promote dissemination. And to date they seem to be the most effective means to secure data regarding the impact of dissemination on students.

The role of project staff as trainers

In every case the impact of a dissemination plan on a project site has demanded extended hours of hard work by all participants. In some cases there have been anxieties and misunderstandings as district staff began working outside the district or as visitors began to arrive in large numbers. In most cases these administrative problems have been successfully resolved by the project directors.

The successful transfer of educational programs among school districts must in large part be attributed to the high quality of the training programs offered by project staff including teachers and principals. Among the most successful formats for this training has been the provision of internship opportunities by project teachers to fellow teachers. To a lesser extent principals have worked directly with one another with similar success.

Participants in producer districts have reported that this work has brought them new opportunities for professional development and that they have learned about new educational practices as part of this experience. This work has in some cases strengthened the project in the original site as project staff gained new perspectives on their work. This type of benefit of dissemination to the producer district was anticipated in the dissemination literature and is summarized in Pathways to Success, page 11.

The extent of program transfer that has been achieved during the first two years of dissemination suggests that district staff are capable of a high standard of training and that these capabilities might be called upon in a number of ways. Some training programs are worthy of accreditation by colleges and universities. In situations in which Title III funding is not available for dissemination or after the period of availability has concluded individual school districts, or the Department of Education might call upon these district staffs to offer training and consultation in return for consultation fees.

These observations suggest that the classroom or at least the school district as the focal point of training for teachers and administrators is of high value to both trainers and trainees and should not be overlooked by any dissemination agency or in any dissemination strategy.

Publicity

Providing publicity for each program with a dissemination plan is the joint responsibility of OPD and the project directors. The latter put most of their efforts into giving orientation presentations and, in some cases, manning booths at conventions. OPD's specific responsibilities are: 1) preparation and distribution of a technical brief describing each project and bearing the Commissioner's endorsement, 2) beginning in 1973-74 preparation and distribution of a catalogue describing all demonstration sites, 3) organizing orientation workshops for one or more projects and issueing invitations to them on a statewide basis and 4) sending a package of each program's materials (when available) to each County Superintendent's Office, the state library, Rutgers School of Education library, the EIC's, and for special education projects the SEIMC's. Detailed information concerning this work will be found in Chapter III of Pathways to Success. Specific activities carried out in 1972-73 and 1973-74 are described in Section II of this report.

For purposes of this narrative we would like to describe the scope of this work and estimate its impact. First we will review the work of OPD. In 1972-73 approximately 40,000 technical briefs were distributed statewide. In 1973-74 approximately 45,000 technical briefs or introductory brochures following other formats and 10,000 catalogues describing all demonstration sites were distributed. During these two years OPD organized twenty orientation workshops for one or more projects; approximately 1,500 persons attended these workshops. Three articles were published in state educational journals. Approximately 145 packages of materials for five projects were distributed to the sites listed above.

Project directors sought opportunities to address conferences, conventions, school districts staffs or other groups who would be interested in the projects and whose knowledge of them and their dissemination plans would contribute to our dissemination goals. Project directors were also encouraged to publish newspaper and journal articles as appropriate to publicize their work. National as well as state audiences were sought. Specific information about these efforts will be found in Section II of this report.

To assess the impact of our mailing efforts approximately 3,400 questionnaires were distributed to persons on our regular mailing list in May, 1974 to ask them to comment on the mailings and their use of the material. Approximately 500 of the questionnaires were returned. In sum those who returned them suggested that we continue the mailing effort. Most said that they found the information valuable and most shared it with persons with whom they work. Most offered useful suggestions about ways in which to publize the programs and confirmed that different avenues of publicity for the projects were reaching them. Virtually all respondents asked to remain on the mailing list. A summary of the specific responses to this questionnaire will be found in Section II.

The OPD staff found that the most effective workshops were those whose audiences shared a common and specific educational need. This enabled the project directors making presentations to give a detailed description of the project which permitted the audience to judge whether to continue to investigate the project. Further we found that it is preferable to cosponsor a workshop with another Department office or branch or an educational association and thus to build upon the cosponsor's working relationship with educators in local districts. At this time we should gratefully acknowledge the cooperative efforts of EIC-South, EIC-NW, the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, NJ School Administrators Association, NJ School Boards Association, and NJEA for their contribution to our dissemination effort. Their helpful suggestions and the dissemination opportunities which they provided have been invaluable. A listing of the workshops sponsored will be found in Section II.

As a result of the publicity concerning the domonstration sites in 1972-73 and 1973-74 approximately 5,000 persons visited them. Approximately 13,000 persons attended at least one of the over 200 orientation presentations that the project staffs made. Approximately 4,000 copies of the projects' program materials have been distributed upon request either free of charge or at cost. As of June, 1974 $ 10,500* been collected for program materials, and over one third of the state's local districts had been involved in a training program for at least one of these programs. To date there is no evaluation of the effectiveness of mailing the program packages to the resource sites listed above beyond the favorable impression shared with the OPD staff of a few recipients.

The scope of this impact leads us to believe that the publicity has been effective, but it is important to remember that total dissemination impact cannot be attributed to publicity alone. It represents a combination of the publicity given a program and the program characteristics that we have already discussed. While some projects definitely could have profited from additional publicity, others could not meet all of the requests for training that they received. Based upon individual requests for information and private conversations with local district staff it seems to the OPD staff that the fact that the office conducts a program dissemination effort that offers training and materials to educators is now widely recognized among administrators. This recognition and the understanding of the extent of the services and materials available provide a basis of familiarity that will aid the publicity efforts for the dissemination program in future years. Individual programs that can be adopted as a result of a teacher's decision alone should receive additional publicity among teachers. Such publicity will be generally supportive of the dissemination of other programs by providing a basis for teacher acceptance.

*This figure does not include the sales receipts of the commercially distributed program.

It is our belief that each project should be more widely publicized in educational journals of national circulation in an effort not only to convey information about them but also about the way in which local school districts are able to train one another to achieve the transfer of successful educational programs.

The transfer of programs among districts: Urban, Suburban, and Rural

Most of the districts in which the New Jersey validated programs have originated are urban or suburban, of medium size and provide adequate administrative support for development. The originating districts of the projects under consideration may be categorized in the following way:

Rural:	Cape May County	Suburban:	Bergen County *
	Winslow		New Providence
			Union
Urban:	Hackensack		Wayne
	New Brunswick		Woodbridge
	Paterson		
	Weehawken		

We looked to see if the adopter districts followed a similar configuration. While the information must be considered rough due to the lack of close acquaintance with all of the consumer districts, we can say that most adopters fall into the suburban or rural categories and that they are adopting projects of urban, suburban, and rural districts of origin. Few urban districts can be counted among the adopters, but those present are adopting projects from suburban and rural areas. This kind of transfer among districts serving different types of communities was unanticipated. It suggests that district staffs making decisions to use these projects did so on the merits of the projects which are not perceived to be limited by considerations of the socio-economic background of the students in the originating districts. We may conclude that the dissemination potential of most projects will go beyond districts of like socio-economic configuration.

*Learncycle was field tested in several Bergen County districts.

Long-term dissemination

When the dissemination program began we were not certain how long it would be necessary to disseminate a program to determine its transferability, nor were the project staff certain about the time they wanted to devote to dissemination. We have seen that the determination of transferability (including student outcome data) will require at least three years for most projects. In several cases this time could be reduced to two years if written materials were prepared during the field test phase. Most project staff have been willing to invest two to three years in dissemination work.

We had anticipated that for projects disseminated over a two to three year period turn-key dissemination sites would be established to provide for long-term dissemination. Dissemination literature suggests that if approximately 3% of the local districts adopt a project the basis for long-term dissemination will be secured. For New Jersey this implies that a project needs eighteen or more adopter districts to provide for its long-term dissemination. For the two years under consideration only four projects (Interning for Learning, MOPPET, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop and SEE) have that number of adopter districts. Our projections through August, 1975 indicate two other projects will come close to this mark although they might not have eighteen adopter districts in the state. (The Dale Avenue Project's projections predict 13 New Jersey adopter districts and those for Individualized Language Arts predict 17.) While several adopter districts report that they are providing in-service work for their own staffs and/or expanding the programs that they had adopted, only one has reported considering offering training or consultation services to other districts. This district is an adopter for Interning for Learning and has asked whether the Office of Program Development would subsidize with Title III funds their offering dissemination services to other districts.

To date the only turn-key training programs that will provide long-term dissemination opportunities to New Jersey educators are those established by the County Superintendent's Offices in Atlantic, Cumberland, Ocean, and Salem counties for Interning for Learning. The Ocean County program is funded entirely from that office's regular budget. Those in the other counties were begun with the office's regular funds but in the current year, 1974-75, the budget for each has been supplemented by an ESEA, Title III consumer grant of approximately $20,000.

It is worth recalling at this point that the only other method that we have found to provide for long-term dissemination is to secure the distribution of program materials through a publisher. It is likely that this will remain one of the most valuable alternatives for long-term dissemination.

These data suggest that the likelihood of an adopter district's acting as a turn-key dissemination agent for long-term dissemination is dim even if a program has been adopted by 3% of the state's districts. If the extent of the adoption is less so is the likelihood of this type of long-term dissemination. We suggest that the reasons for this may be similar to those that influenced the OPD dissemination program initially. The need for an adequate supply of program materials, the additional work load required, and the demands of publicizing this type of service will all influence the provision of long-term dissemination sites by local districts. In

addition, the uncertainty of the propriety of this role for a local district whose primary responsibilities are to its immediate constituency often may inhibit active participation in dissemination.

For those projects which are judged by the Department of Education to merit long-term dissemination several alternatives are open. First, OPD may provide for an adequate supply of program materials to be printed for at least one year of dissemination work with the understanding that either the Department or the originating district will sell the materials at cost and reprint them from the sales receipts as required. This will overcome one barrier to long-term dissemination.

Second, the staff of a project's originating site and/or those of successful adopter districts may provide training or consultation services in return for payments made by an adopter district directly to an individual who provides services on his/her own time or to a Board of Education that releases a staff member to provide these services. The merit of the latter approach is that it may encourage a producer district to provide internship experiences in its classrooms for persons learning the program. And, as has been seen this is a highly successful mode of dissemination.

A variation of this alternative is the incorporation by a teacher training institution in its course offerings of training in one or more of the validated programs. Such arrangements could build upon the provision of program materials as described above and could be made by a college or university directly with a Board of Education.

Notice of the availability of materials and services on the bases described above could be included in the OPD catalogue Educational Programs that Work thus providing some of the requisite publicity. The success of this approach would depend heavily upon the extent of the Department's recommendation of this type of dissemination. Should training be accredited by or incorporated into a course of a teacher training institution, this would also provide an important endorsement of its merit as well as publicity for its existence. This second alternative and its variations provide for the availability of program materials, compensation for the staff time required, and publicity of the opportunities available. They also have the merit of requiring relatively little funding from the Department.

Other alternatives for long-term dissemination include the Department's encouraging the active participation of its various offices and/or branches in program dissemination such as that undertaken by the County Superintendent's offices for Interning for Learning and/or the continued funding of the demonstration sites through Title III and/or other funding sources. This alternative calls upon the Department to reallocate its human and fiscal resources to disseminate one or more programs just as a local district must do to adopt or adapt one or more programs. Such reallocation can be justified in the Department's case only if the dissemination effort is critical to enable local districts to meet their educational needs.

The extent to which the OPD staff and/or the Department as a whole should invest its resources in the dissemination of an educational program should reflect not only the program's transferability but also the demand for its continuing dissemination, its specific dissemination requirements, and the relative importance of the educational need which it addresses.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF LOCAL DISTRICTS

At this point our best indication of whether the dissemination program is meeting the needs of local districts is the demand for the materials and services of the demonstration sites. We have already seen that the sites attracted approximately 5,000 visitors, distributed 4,000 copies of their materials, trained 1,058 New Jersey citizens and reported 225 New Jersey adopter districts for the period under consideration. We anticipate that by August, 1975 these demonstration site staffs will have trained a total of 1,825 New Jersey citizens from a total of 390 New Jersey districts. (Training and adopter districts outside of New Jersey are not included in these figures.) In most cases adopter districts report that they are using the training they received and are experiencing moderate to high success with the programs they are using. We may presume that educators or community members who were not trained but who visited program sites and/or requested materials have found this level of participation in the dissemination effort of value. This conclusion is implied by the fact that in 1974-75 the demonstration sites are receiving increasing numbers of visitors and increasing demand for their materials.

Since the training time that most project directors had allotted was fully booked we may also conclude that we have helped local districts meet their educational needs to the extent of our capabilities in training time. We can accommodate greater numbers of visitors and distribute greater quantities of materials and should publicize the demonstration sites more to increase participation in the dissemination program at this level. We do not yet have enough evidence to say whether the dissemination program has contributed to an improvement in overall student performance in the cognitive and/or affective domains. But we anticipate that significant improvement will occur for many students and we are modifying the dissemination program in ways to raise this frequency. But the number of students who show this kind of improvement will vary with the extent to which dissemination resources are invested in highly transferable programs and the provisions for long-term dissemination.

The extent to which the dissemination program does aid local districts to meet their educational needs will also depend upon the extent to which those needs are defined and the willingness of district staffs to address them. The extent of the definition of needs and ranking according to importance of local educational needs varies greatly among districts, but we hypothesize that a careful definition of need and the concentration of district resources to meet needs of high priority is the basis for many of the successful program transfers that we have seen. If we had information on local district needs assessments and the ranking of needs according to their importance we could use this information to help select programs for dissemination. In this way we could use our dissemination resources more efficiently to help New Jersey educators meet local educational needs to a greater extent.

Conclusions

We have evidence from the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years that program transfer can and does take place. The validity of this conclusion is reinforced by the progress of dissemination during the first half of the 1974-75 academic year. In examining the degree and type of transfer we have been able to identify the program variables that contribute most significantly to it. We have limited data to indicate that students in adopter districts are in some cases realizing success comparable to that of students in the districts in which the programs originated.

Further data are required for a better understanding of the comparability of student results in producer and consumer districts. On a preliminary basis we may conclude that these data confirm the hypothesis of the OPD staff that successful educational programs may be designed and field tested on a cooperative basis by the SEA and LEA's and subsequently transferred to other districts.

Our data suggest the program variables that influence dissemination potential. This profile will be useful to persons responsible for program design so that they may give careful consideration to a program's dissemination potential in the design and field test phases. It is recommended that this profile in addition to a profile of the needs of local school districts be used to select a limited number of programs to disseminate from among eligible candidates. This recommendation is made because the hypothesis that successful programs may be transferred seems to have been verified, therefore the dissemination of each validated program beyond a reporting of it no longer seems required. This type of selection will permit the most effective use of the OPD staff and fiscal resources available for the dissemination effort to meet local educational needs.

General observations on the dissemination process validate the procedures followed. New insights suggest that there is the potential of widespread transfer of educational programs among districts whose students come from widely different socio-economic backgrounds. The generally high level of the training programs offered by project staff suggest that they should be accredited by colleges and universities. The reciprocal advantages for professional development to staff of both producer and consumer districts in the dissemination process gives evidence for the high potential of inter-district transfer of educational programs.

Judging from the demand for the visitation opportunities, program materials, and training and consultation services, the dissemination effort is aiding district staff to meet local educational needs almost to the full extent of the capability of the demonstration sites. Further measures of the extent to which local educational needs are being met will require finer delineation of local needs and the priorities of these needs, and additional data on the student impact of the adoption or adaptation of the validation programs.

Our capability to aid districts meet local educational needs will increase if we use these needs as a guide for the selection of programs to disseminate and if we provide for the long-term dissemination of programs for which there is a demonstrable long-term demand.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION
Impact and Cost

1972-73, 1973-74

PROJECTED SUMMARY OF
DISSEMINATION IMPACT AND COST

1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75

	Students in Program in originating district	Total adopter districts (out of state)		Total persons trained (out of state)		Total students in program (out of state)		Budget	Total adopter districts (out of state)		Total persons trained (out of state)		Total students in program (out of state)		Budget
Dale Avenue Project	550	9	1	360	48	3,924	425	$144,137	24	11	840	368	13,299	6,675	$ 226,844
Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	50	3	--	51	--	30	--	$16,465	3	--	51	--	30	--	$16,465
Individualized Language Arts	2,300	10	--	139	--	5,569	--	$11,425	27	10	223	55	7,444	1,250	$35,925
Interning for Learning	2,375	44	--	172	--	3,850	--	$113,772	78	--	453	--	13,200	--	$113,772
Learning Center	100	2	--	78	--	81	--	$ 2,620	2	--	78	--	81		$ 2,620
LEM	1,250	6	--	79	--	1,392	--	$38,761	11	2	134	22	2,642	500	$70,170
MOPPET	8,602	25	3	124	4	4,375	500	$22,883	39	3	308	4	6,750	500	$52,883
Open Classroom	500	3	--	51	--	900	--	$59,287	6	--	105	--	1,200	--	$145,404
Pollution Control Education Center	1,200	Distributed by a commercial publisher				30,000		$ 1,500			6		45,000		$ 600
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	45	18	--	56	--	270	--	$17,647	20	--	82	--	300	--	$27,532
SEE	800	131	23			8,150	800	$56,584	631	423	--	--	23,525	12,300	$82,382
TOTALS	17,772	251	27	1,110	52	58,541	1725	$485,081	841	449	2,280	449	113,471	21,225	$774,597

ESEA, Title III Dissemination Program

Evaluation Report, 1972-73, 1973-74

Section II

Office of Program Development
Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Department of Education
State of New Jersey

February, 1975

Prepared by Dorothy B. Soper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION I: Narrative Summary	
Transferability	3
OPD Dissemination Policy: Selection of Programs for Dissemination	6
OPD Dissemination Procedures:	10
Producer-Consumer Agreements	10
Staffing of dissemination Programs	11
Timing of dissemination	12
Publishers	12
Incentive grants for adopter districts	13
The role of project staff as trainers	13
Publicity	14
The transfer of programs among districts: Urban, Suburban, and Rural	16
Long-term dissemination	17
Educational Needs of Local Districts	19
Conclusions and Summary of Program Dissemination Impact	19
SECTION II: Summary Reports of Dissemination Activities	22
Office of Program Development	23
Dale Avenue Project	27
Educational Services for Schoolage Parents	39
Individualized Language Arts	48
Interning for Learning	57
Learning Center	72
LEM	74
MOPPET	89
Open Classroom	99
Pollution Control Education Center	106
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop	109
SEE	116

SUMMARY OF OPD DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES

1972-73

Orientation presentations coordinated or organized by OPD

1. Participation of projects with disseminations in roundtable discussions at the N.J. School Boards Association convention, September, 1972. Nine projects participated. Attendance varied from 2 - 15 per table.

2. Workshop cosponsored with the N.J. Association of School Administrators, November 29, 1972, Ramada Inn, East Brunswick. Ten projects participated. Attendance, approximately 120.

3. Workshop cosponsored with EIC-South, November 9, 1972. Ten projects participated. Attendance, approximately 30.

4. Workshop cosponsored with the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, Department of Education, Trenton, February 15, 1973. Two projects participated. Attendance, approximately 60.

Mailings

Winter and spring of 1972;
standard mailing list of Superintendents, Board Presidents, County Superintendent's Offices, and Department staff: technical briefs for seven projects.

Fall, 1972;
standard mailing list above plus elementary school principals: Overview brochure for LEM, MOPPET, SEE, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, Pollution Control Education.

Winter, 1973;
standard mailing list plus all principals: Catalogue of all Title III projects.

Articles;
"Educational Innovations that Work", School Board Notes, August 31, 1972.

Large quantities of technical briefs and the Title III catalogue were sent to EIC-South.

1973-74

Orientation presentations coordinated by OPD

1. In cooperation with EIC-NW:

   a. Project SEE, two sessions, October 30, 1973. Attendance, approximately 50.
   b. Project LEM and the Dale Avenue Project, November 2, 1973. Attendance, approximately 70.
   c. Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, November 7, 1973. Attendance, approximately 35.
   d. Project MOPPET, two sessions, December 7, 1973. Attendance, approximately 50.

2. In cooperation with the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, Department of Education; two workshops: September 27, 1974 at Glassboro State College and October 9, 1974 at EIC-NW. Total attendance approximately 200.

3. In cooperation with N.J.E.A. at the annual teachers' convention, November 15-17, 1974, series of eight one hour presentations by project directors. Booth space reserved on the Musicians' Balcony and used by MOPPET and SEE with coffee provided by Title III. Attendance at presentations from 25 - 100. Approximately 250 persons visited booths.

4. Pollution Control Education workshop in Union, November 8, 1973 for environmental educators. Attendance, approximately 35.

5. Educational Services for Schoolage Parents in New Brunswick, January, 1974 for social workers, guidance personnel, school nurses, and other interested parties. Attendance, approximately 25.

Mailings

Unless otherwise noted all mailings were to the standard mailing list which will be found on page 36 of Pathways to Success. This includes approximately 4,500 names.

Fall, 1974:
Educational Programs that Work, 1973-74
Brochures for LEM, Dale Avenue Project, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, MOPPET, Learning Center, Open Classroom.

As each program's written materials became available a box of them was sent to EIC-South, EIC-NW, each County Superintendent's Office, Rutgers School of Education library, State Library, and the N.J.E.A. library. Materials were distributed for Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, LEM, Educational Services for Schoolage Parents, SEE, MOPPET, Pollution Control Education (donated by McGraw-Hill). Materials for special education projects were sent to SEIMC Centers.

Articles:
"Title III Project", The Administrator, Winter, 1973, pp. 28-9
"Pathways to Success", N.J.E.A. Review, April, 1974, pp. 28-30

Evaluation Survey

In March, 1974 an evaluation survey was sent by OPD to approximately 3,500 Board Presidents, Superintendents, Helping Teachers, Social Workers, and Principals to ask their assessment of the publicity provided for the dissemination program. A total of 503 responses were received from the following persons:

Superintendents	157	Social Workers	19
Board Presidents	7	Helping Teachers	20
Principals	251	Other	49

A summary of the responses to the individual questions is given below.

	RESPONSES	
	Yes	No
1. Questions concerning the materials mailed by OPD:		
Did you use any of these materials?	366	130
Did you make them available to other persons?	431	65
If yes, to whom? Responses referred generally to other staff members of a district.		
2. Questions concerning activities that grew out of reading the materials:		
Did you seek additional information about one or more programs?	368	179
Did you attend an orientation about one or more programs?	249	243
Did you invite a representative of a demonstration site to give a presentation in your district?	110	381
Did you visit one or more of the demonstration sites?	280	213
3. Do you feel that the mailings are an effective way to inform New Jersey citizens about the demonstration sites?	444	42
4. Do you feel that any of the following methods should be used to inform New Jersey citizens about the demonstration sites next year:		
Orientation workshops for individual programs	272	214
Orientation workshops for several programs at which participants can visit presentations on three or four projects	265	232

5. Suggestions for other ways in which New Jersey educators might be informed about the demonstration sites included the use of radio, television, local newspapers, conventions and conferences, continued mailings.

6. Other sources of information for respondents about demonstration sites included conventions, personal contacts, EIC-South, EIC-NW, County Superintendents, fellow staff members, professional meetings, etc.

		1973-74 Yes	1973-74 No
7.	Do you wish to remain on the mailing list for information about the demonstration sites that will be in operation in 1974-75?	496	6

OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

January - June, 1972	$10,000
July, 1972- June, 1973	20,500
July, 1973 - June, 1974	32,000

DALE AVENUE PROJECT: Performance Objective Curriculum
for Prekindergarten through Third Grade, Paterson, N.J.
Validated, 1973

Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:		
	1972-73	$ $5,000
	1973-74	139,137
	1974-75	82,707
		$ 226,844

PROGRAM USE IN PATERSON AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

1 school, Dale Avenue School, grades Pre-K - 3
550 students
21 teachers
2 aides

The program at the Dale Avenue School is funded through ESEA, Title I for the prekindergarten teachers (4) and two aides. Teachers in grades K-3 and administrative staff are funded through Board of Education funds. Continuing training and consultation services are provided by staff supported with ESEA, Title III funds.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

			Administrators trained	2
1972-73	Adopter districts	1	Students in program	108
	Teachers trained	5		
	Others trained	4		
			N.J.	Out of state
1973-74	New districts entering		7	1
	Teachers trained		215	20
	Administrators trained		20	5
	Others trained		68	23
	Students in program		3,391	425
1974-75	Projections			
	New districts entering program		5	10
	Teachers to be trained		125	250
	Administrators to be trained		10	20
	Others to be trained		25	20
	Students in program		3,125	6,250

TOTALS FOR DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

	1972-73, 1973-74	projected cumulative figures 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75
Adopter districts	9	24
Teachers trained	240	615
Administrators trained	27	57
Others trained	93	168
Students in program	3,924	13,299

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $11.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $5,000

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief 8,000 copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 20

Approximately 19 introductory presentations to approximately 168 persons:

Workshop cosponsored by Office of Program Development and N.J. School Administrators Assoc., East Brunswick, approximately 40 persons, October, 1972.

N.J. School Boards Association Conference, roundtable discussion, October, 1972, approximately 15 persons.

Workshop cosponsored by Educational Improvement Center-South and Office of Program Development, November, 1972, approximately 20 persons.

Workshop cosponsored by Office of Program Development, and Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, Trenton, May, 1973, approximately 60 persons.

Ed Fair '73, Washington, D.C., sponsored by USOE, May, 1973, approximately 200 persons.

Team Teaching Workshop, sponsored by Ryder College, July, 1973, approximately 20 persons.

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION RENDERED

Essential elements of the program:

a. The use of the Dale Avenue Performance Objectives as the skill development sequence of a curriculum, as a grouping device, and as the basis of pre and post tests of skill mastery.

b. The inclusion of parents in the classroom setting as volunteer and/or salaried aides, clerical aides, and guides for visitors.

c. Accurate record keeping of children's mastery of the skills of the Dale Avenue Performance Objectives.

Training for District Staff:

A two day, twelve hour, training program has been organized to train districts in the program's essential elements. Staff members of the Stokes School in Trenton were trained in the summer, 1973. See the following chart for a training summary.

TRAINING SUMMARY, 1972 - 1973

DISTRICT	SCHOOLS	TEACHERS	AIDES	ADMINISTRATORS	BOARD OF EDUCATION	PARENT	OTHER	PROJECTED # OF STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
TRENTON	STOKES	5	4	2				4 first grade

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $139,173

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Final Report	1,000	copies
Performance Objective Manual	2,000	copies
Teacher's Guide	2,000	copies
Administrator's Guide	1,000	copies
Roll Book	2,000	copies
Special Area Performance Objectives	1,000	copies
Learning Activities	1,000	copies
Overview brochure	10,000	copies
Order form for materials	8,000	copies
"What comes after ten, Tasha?", 28-1/2 minute, 16 mm color overview film	25	copies
Prototype evaluation for consumer districts	50	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 197

Approximately 37 introductory presentations to approximately 1100 persons:

Workshop sponsored by Office of Program Development and Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, Glassboro State College, September 27, 1973, approximately 35 persons.

Second session of above, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, September 9, 1973, approximately 35 persons.

Workshop for personnel of Bureau of Indian Affairs schools/districts, October 15-17, 1973, Phoenix, Arizona, approximately 100 persons.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest orientation for N.J. school personnel, November 2, 1973, approximately 30 persons.

N.J.E.A. Convention, one hour presentation, November 15, 1973, approximately 50 persons.

Center City Catholic School, Camden, November 11, 1974, approximately 15 persons.

Phi Delta Kappa Conference, Atlantic City, March 9, 1974, approximately 25 persons.

Spotswood teachers and principal, Spotswood, March 18, 1974, approximately 10 persons.

Dooly County, Georgia, April 16-17, 1974, approximately 30 administrators and teachers, and steering committee.

National Association of Elementary School Principals, Anaheim, California, April 26, 1974, approximately 200 persons.

N.J.E.A. Good Ideas Conference, Monmouth College, April 27, 1974, approximately 50 persons.

St. Thomas the Apostle School, Bloomfield, May 4, 1974, approximately 60 persons.

N.J. Speech and Hearing Association Conference, Great Gorge, May 5, 1974, approximately 20 persons.

Criterion Reading Conference, Atlantic City, May 7, 1974, approximately 250 persons.

Fairlawn Administrators, May 8, 1974, approximately 5 persons.

Title I Conference, Cherry Hill, May 30, 1974, approximately 60 persons.

Paterson Board of Education, June 6, 1974, approximately 150 persons.

Radio Coverage

Interview on W.P.A.T.

TV Coverage

Video-taped commentary on WNBC, New York with Carl Stokes; taped at the Dale Avenue School

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

Most of the program materials listed on the previous page were available for use in the training workshops in the spring and summer. Approximately 200 sets of materials were ordered by adopter districts including the nonpublic schools in Paterson and Passaic.

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential elements of the program:

a. The use of the Dale Avenue Performance Objectives as the skill development sequence of a curriculum, as a grouping device, and as the basis of pre and post tests of skill mastery.

b. The inclusion of parents in the classroom setting as volunteer and/or salaried aides, clerical aides, and guides for visitors.

c. Accurate record keeping of children's mastery of the skills of the Dale Avenue Performance Objectives.

Training for District Staff:

Training in the essential components of the project listed above occurs in a 2-1/2 day training session offered at the consumer school or a site mutually convenient to producer and consumer district staffs. In addition a fifteen-session, thirty hour training course was offered to teachers in the Paterson public and nonpublic schools on successive Wednesdays.

Followup Consultation:

Two to three followup consultations by a member of the project staff are recommended for the school year following the training.

Training and Followup Consultation Summaries:

The training and followup consultation provided for the Paterson public schools and schools in other districts whose staffs had signed a Producer-Consumer Agreement or had an approved ESEA, Title III proposal for the project's replication are detailed on the following pages.

TRAINING SUMMARY, 1973 - 1974

DISTRICT	SCHOOLS	TEACHERS	AIDES	ADMINISTRATORS	BOARD OF EDUCATION	PARENT	OTHER	PROJECTED # OF STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
Paterson and Passaic Catholic Schools May 13-15, 1974	4	110		1	2			2,075 K-3
Plainfield May 22-24, 1974	Jefferson	5	5	2	2	2		158 K-1
Mannington Twp. May 29-31, 1974	Mannington	8	2	1	1	4		120 K-1
Roselle May 13-14, 1974	Lincoln	7	1	2	1	1		25 Pre-K
Spotswood June, 1974	Appleby	12		1	none for entire training	none for entire training		175 K-1
Dooley County Board of Education, Vienna, Georgia August, 1974	Byronville Unidella Vienna	20	18	5		4 or 5		425 Pre-K - 1
Fairlawn	Supplementary instruction program, 7 schools	25		1				100 1-6
Trenton July, 1974	Stokes	8	6	2				188 K-2

CONSULTATION SUMMARY, 1973 - 1974

DISTRICT & SCHOOL(s)	DATES	AREA OF CONSULTATION	NUMBER OF PROJECT STAFF
Trenton Stokes School	10/23/74	Continued training, 1st grade	2
	11/9/73	Monitoring, 1st grade Attending parent meeting	2
Paterson Annex 12	2/10/74	Monitoring K class	2
	2/28/74	Monitoring K class	2
	3/6-8/74	Rearranged & taught K class	3
	4/2/74	Conference with K teacher & principal	2
	4/74 - 6/74	Staff member acted as aides	1

Consultation visits to Stokes School verified use of the program in nine skill areas. Encoding-decoding skills were taught separately following the school's regular reading program. There are no data on student achievement in this area.

The program was not replicated in the Paterson public school system beyond the Dale Avenue School.

CONTINUED CONSULTATION SUMMARY, 1973 - 1974

DISTRICT	DATES	AREA OF CONSULTATION	NUMBER OF PROJECT STAFF
Mannington	11/26/73	Help in planning grant	2
	4/10/74	Help in writing grant	2
	4/11/74	Overview of program and answers to question	2
Spotswood	4/10/74	Helped them write proposal	2

TRAINING SUMMARY, 1973 - 1974

DISTRICT	SCHOOLS	TEACHERS	AIDES	ADMINISTRATORS	BOARD OF EDUCATION	PARENT	OTHER	PROJECTED # OF STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
Plainfield, June 25-26, 1974	Clinton Washington	4 (including special area teachers)	20	6	1	6		100 PreK - 1
Paterson Public Schools Fall, 1973	Dale Avenue	22	20	2				550 PreK-3
Paterson Public Schools Fall, 1973	12 (#6,8,12 Annex 15,17,18,19,21 24,26,27	14		2				no knowledge, teachers were trained, but not committed to using program
TOTALS: 9	31	235	72	25	7	17 or 18		3,816 PreK - 6

40

EVALUATION DATA ON PROJECT ADOPTION

Dale Avenue School, Paterson:

In January, 1974 the Paterson Board of Education passed a resolution to adopt the Dale Avenue Performance Objective Curriculum as the curriculum for the Dale Avenue School. The program is not used in any other Paterson public school despite the fact that the project staff conducted training sessions for staff members of other Paterson schools and provided monitoring services to one school.

Continued evaluation of the performance of students in the Dale Avenue School yielded these findings:

Mean I.Q. on Peabody of children in Pre-K continued to show significant gain at the end of each year. By the end of Kindergarten each year, mean of group has always remained at or around the national norm. I.Q. mean scores for first and second grade children, reported at national norm in final report (72-73) maintained these scores and were at the national norm at the end of the second and third grade.

Children continued to show progress in achievement on performance objective record.

Stokes School, Trenton:

Replication of the Dale Avenue Project was begun at Stokes School in Trenton in 4 first grade classes in 1973-74. The replication was incomplete, however, since there is no record of students' attainment on encoding-decoding skills. The change to a new reading text and the lack of coordination between the encoding-decoding skills taught and those taught in nine other areas of the Dale Avenue Project account for this.

The replication of the Dale Avenue Project begun at Stokes School in four first grade classes in 1973-74 will continue at the following level in 1974-75:

K - four classes
1 - four classes
2 - one class

Funding for the salary of the project director will continue from ESEA, Title III funds. Whether the program will be maintained past the period of Title III funds is not known.

The performance of the Stokes students in the program was evaluated by the following tests: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, two tests developed by the Dale Avenue project: Skill Assessment Test and Identity and Body Parts Test, and the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test.

On the PPVT and the Gates MacGinitie the Stokes scores were compared to those of a randomly selected sample of students at another school in Trenton and the Dale Avenue School. On the PPVT the Stokes students showed growth and the control students' scores showed regression. The posttest scores of the Stokes students were not as high as those of the Dale Avenue School students. The results show that there is a statistically significant difference in the performance of the students in the two schools.

On the two Dale Avenue staff developed tests, pretests showed that the Dale Avenue students in kindergarten scored higher than did the Stokes first grade students. At the end of the year, however, the posttest revealed no significant difference between the two sets of students being compared. Thus the Stokes students had caught up with the Dale Avenue students. It should be noted that comparing the scores of the first graders at Stokes with those of Kindergarten students at the Dale Avenue School is valid since both sets of students were in their second year of school experience.

Posttesting on the Gates MacGinitie showed no significant difference between experimental and control group students in Trenton. The Dale Avenue students did score higher than either group. It should be noted that the Stokes students showed regression between the pre and posttests.

Further evaluation of the program at Stokes School will continue in 1974-75.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR SCHOOLAGE PARENTS, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75
Validated 1973

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:	1972-73	$ 6,024
	1973-74	10,441
		$16,465

PROGRAM USE IN NEW BRUNSWICK AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

Approximately 50 students per year served.

Program supported by Board of Education and state funds provided for special education.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

1972-73 No formal training provided. Orientation presentations were given and visitors accommodated.

1973-74	Persons trained	51	Districts replicating aspects of program	3
	Districts represented	27	Students served	30

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $6,024

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Text for Resource Manual	prepared, not printed
Technical Brief	5,000 copies, printed spring 1972
Overview filmstrip/tape	25 copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 285

Orientation presentations given to approximately 800 persons:

N.J. School Board Association Convention, October, 1972, roundtable discussion.

N.J.E.A. Convention, November, 1972, one hour presentation.

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshop, November, 1972, East Brunswick.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, November, 1972.

Middlesex County School Nurses Association, Edison, N.J., one hour presentation, November 17, 1972.

Family Life Conference, Middlesex County College, N.J., March 21, 1973, one hour presentation.

New Jersey State Conference, Holiday Inn, New Brunswick, N.J., May 8, 1973 - one hour presentation (a.m.) plus two and one-half hour group discussion (p.m.).

Franklin Township Child Care and Development Department.

Greater New Brunswick Day Care Center Instructors

Somerset, N.J. Home Economics Teachers

Cook College of Rutgers University Nutrition Aides

Burlington County, N.J. Pupil Personnel Services

SAGE, Paterson, N.J.

Hudson County, N.J. Area Vocational Technical School - Home Economics Dept.

Written inquiries about program

From New Jersey	16
From out of state	7

No formal training program was offered.

1973-74

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $10,441

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Revised Technical Brief	5,000 copies
Resource Manual	500 copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project	256

Introductory presentations given to approximately 993 persons:

Social Workers Meeting - N.J.E.A. Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., two hour presentation and discussion, November 15, 1973.

Annual Convention of Vocational Home Science and Arts Association of New Jersey, Asbury Park, N.J., two hour presentation and discussion, March 30, 1974.

Eastern Regional Conference, Child Welfare League of America, Atlantic City, N.J., two hour presentation, April 26, 1974.

N.J. Association of Federal Program Administrators, Cherry Hill, N.J., one hour workshop, May, 1974.

Visiting Nurses Association, New Brunswick, N.J., one hour presentation, May 30, 1974.

Division of Youth and Family Services, New Brunswick, N.J., one hour presentation plus one hour discussion, June 12, 1974.

Written inquiries about program

From New Jersey	80
From out of state	53

Materials distributed

Resource Manuals	474	given away
	2	sold at $3 each

TRAINING WORKSHOPS OFFERED

Essential elements of the Program:

1. Instruction in family life education.
2. Lunch program.
3. Social work and counseling services.
4. Instruction in academic subjects.

Training:

The project staff offered two one-day training sessions during the school year and a three-day training session in June in the project's essential elements. Persons trained are listed on the following pages:

NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Department of Pupil Personnel Services

1973 - 1974

Participants in the One-Day Orientation Workshops

Participants in the two one-day orientation workshops were representative of a wide and varied milieu, as indicated by the following lists:

One-Day Orientation Workshop

January 23, 1974.....Attendance 23

1. Dr. Dorothy L. Aymas; Medical Director, Union City Schools, Union City, N.J.
2. Mrs. Susan Carle; Coordinator, Dept. of Special Services, Orange, N.J.
3. Mrs. Marcia Cohen; Social Worker, St. Peter's Hospital, New Brunswick, N.J.
4. Mrs. Ardis A. Condon, School Nurse, Englishtown, N.J.
5. Mrs. Beatrice Conrad; School Social Worker, Woodbridge Twp., N.J.
6. Mrs. Walter Donovan; Child Study Supervisor, Ocean County Dept. of Ed., Toms River, N.J.
7. Mrs. Eleanor Engelbrecht; Consultant, Trenton, N.J.
8. Mrs. Judy Fullerston; Nurse Mid-Wife, Margaret Hague Hospital, Jersey City, N.J.
9. Mrs. Ruth Granstrom; Regional School Social Worker, Office of County Superintendent of Schools, Westfield, N.J.
10. Ms. Marcie Hammer; LDT-C, East Orange Board of Ed., East Orange, N.J.
11. Ms. Gloria Hester; Social Worker, East Orange Board of Ed., East Orange, N.J.
12. Mrs. Martin; East Orange, N.J.
13. Miss Emma Meister; Director, Special Services Board of Ed., Union City, N.J.
14. Miss Shirley Moore; Teacher-in-Charge, Lincoln School, Camden, N.J.
15. Mr. Edward O'Keefe; Psychologist, Board of Ed., Union City, N.J.
16. Miss Helen Ohlbach; LDT-C, Union City Board of Ed., Union City, N.J.

NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Department of Pupil Personnel Services

1973 - 1974

Participants in the One-Day Orientation Workshops

January 23, 1974.....Attendance 23 (cont'd)

17. Mrs. Marie Oldham; East Orange, N.J.

18. Mrs. Gloria Pitchford; East Orange, N.J.

19. Ms. Elizabeth H. Repp; Regional School Social Worker, Gloucester County Office of Education, Sewell, N.J.

20. Ms. Harriet Mae Giebels; Chairman of Nurses, Englishtown, N.J.

21. Ms. Josephine Snyder; Guidance Counselor, North Brunswick High School, North Brunswick, N.J.

22. Ms. Elaine Stemmle; Executive Director, Ocean City Unit for Retarded Children, Brick Town, N.J.

23. Miss Frances Van Blake; Social Worker, Dept. of Special Services, Orange, N.J.

<u>One-Day Orientation Workshop</u>

April 9, 1974.....Attendance 7

1. Mrs. Kate Barrett; Director Youth and Family Services, Bureau of Resource Development, Trenton, N.J.

2. Dr. Lenore Mogin; Director, Special Services, Dunellen Public Schools, Dunellen, N.J.

3. Mrs. Kathleen Higgins; Guidance Counselor, Irvington High School, Irvington, N.J.

4. Mrs. Dorothy Hummel; Nurse, Abraham-Clark High School, Roselle, N.J.

5. Mrs. Gwenovere Clark; Guidance Counselor, South River High School, South River, N.J.

6. Ms. Albert Collier; Administrative Assistant to Pupil Personnel, Piscataway, N.J.

7. Mrs. Dorothy Donner; Chairman of Health Education, Piscataway High School, Piscataway, N.J.

NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Department of Pupil Personnel Services

1973 - 1974

The two workshop orientation programs which took place on January 23, 1973 and April 9, 1974, primarily stressed the overall purposes, goals and benefits of this program to the schoolage parents. The participants were able to observe the academic program in action as well as to hear from one of the academic teachers what subjects were offered, how records were handled, how books were secured and how well students performed in their new environment. The staff nurse presented a broad outline on the maternal and child health programs with emphasis on prenatal and postnatal care. The role of the program in the community and its relationship to community agencies was reviewed and discussed. The lunch which was prepared by the students was enjoyed by all who attended. The agenda for the afternoon included a presentation regarding our homemaking education and funding which covered ESEA Title III Consumer Grants available for 1974-1975.

The reaction of the participants was overwhelmingly in favor of such a program. They were particularly impressed by the physical facilities for conducting all of the activities. They were interested in every phase of what we were doing from nutrition, homemaking, pre and postnatal care to the academics. They also wanted to know if we could observe any noticeable difference in the students' emotional and academic performance as a result of being at the Learning Center.

The overall reaction seemed to be of complete acceptance. As a direct result of these one-day orientation workshops, inquiries and invitations to make presentations were received.

Participants in the Summer Training Workshop

Participants in the three-day summer workshop were interested in a more detailed in-depth study of all phases of the program. Participants were as follows:

Workshop.....June 25, 26, 27, 1974

Attendance

1. Doris B. Lockett, East Orange High School
2. Florence Skadnik, East Orange High School
3. Mary Rogers, East Orange High School
4. Marguerite Martin, Coordinator, East Orange High School
5. Pattyann Des Marais, Monroe Township High School
6. Claire Snyder, Monroe Township High School

7. Carolyn Benson, Middlesex County Welfare (former student)

8. Trudie Wescott, Williamstown, N.J.

9. Kathleen Barrun, Williamstown, N.J.

10. Gloria M. Frank, Cambridge School, Debran Township Board of Ed., Debran, N.J.

11. Carolyn Bouleware, Piscataway High School, Guidance Department, Piscataway, N.J. 08854

12. Sally Gamble, Prime Coordinator, Passaic Public Schools, Passaic, N.J.

13. Kate Barrett, Director of Yough and Family Services, Trenton, N.J.

14. Dr. Lenore Mogins, Director of Special Services, Dunellen Public Schools, Dunellen, N.J.

15. Kathleen Higgins, Guidance Coynselor, Irvington High School, Irvington, N.J.

16. Dorothy Hummel, R.N., Abraham Clark High School, Roselle, N.J.

17. Albert Collier, Administrative Assistant, Piscataway, N.J.

18. Gwenovere Clark, South River High School, South River, N.J.

19. Carol Reynolds, Social Worker, Abraham Clark High School, Roselle, N.J.

20. Mary Thomas Moore, Collier School, Wickatunk, N.J.

21. Joanne Curzie, Debran, N.J.

The three-day workshop orientation took place on June 25, 26 and 27, 1974, at the Family Learning Center in New Brunswick (see attached program). On the first day, the agenda included an in-depth study of all phases of the program. Mrs. Kelly introduced the staff and presented Dr. Geoffrey W. Esty, F.A.C.P., Chief Medical Consultant to the project. She also gave a brief overview of the program. The main attraction for

the morning was a panel of three former students with their babies and the staff. The ensuing discussion was not only lively but very informative in allowing the participants to get first-hand the impact of the program upon the students. The group was very impressed by both the easygoing relationship and total respect which the students had for the staff and the great concern that staff had for students.

After lunch, Dr. Christian Hansen, Rutgers Medical School, explored the blood studies being conducted on the students. The results of these studies was just another reason for the continuance of our program and starting new ones over the State of New Jersey.

On the second day, the program was begun by Mrs. Suzanne Phillips, Doctoral Candidate in Psychology, who spoke on a New Approach to Effective Teaching. She was followed by Dr. Kenneth Gould, Psychiatric Consultant,who discussed the psychological needs of the pregnant adolescent. These two speakers contributed a great deal of information which provided the listeners with new insights on how to handle the students in any number of situations.

On the third day, the curriculum and the visitation of Satellite Centers was thoroughly explored. Teachers were on hand in the various classrooms where learning materials were on display. The afternoon session included community involvement funding. Mrs. Doris Blackman portrayed very poignantly ways in which the community was involved.

The reactions to this three-day orientation was obvious almost from the first day. Here are a few excerpts taken directly from the evaluation sheets distributed to all participants.

> "I found the entire program very interesting and informative from every aspect. My only regret is that more schools were not involved to help originate more interest in this program throughout the State. Each person (staff) is a very special individual and this comes through in conversation. The speakers were so special. I am so glad to have been here and I thank you all for being so nice to me. I just figured we drove 528 miles to attend the three days and it was very worthwhile."

> "I believe the information you provided is invaluable and performs a great service. I only wish that more schools were represented and could have the benefit of seeing such a program. The entire staff deserves a lot of credit for all their dedication and sincerity. I thoroughly enjoyed the workshop and Patty Ann and I will certainly keep in touch with you."

NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Department of Pupil Personnel Services

STATEWIDE DISSEMINATION IMPACT

Dissemination activities have created a profound impact, statewide. In addition to the effects on education, a great interest in health has been demonstrated statewide. The obvious awareness and involvement of the producer staff have been responsible for a great deal of this impact.

Three districts have adopted this program and are in full operation, with some modifications. These are: Sage-Paterson, Monroe Township and East Orange. Bergen County is in the process of establishing a county facility and Matawan has recently requested our consultation services.

Since this program has received wide acclaim, several districts have inquired about sending students on a tuition basis. Union County, Franklin Township, Highland Park and Edison have requested this placement; however, we have been unable to accommodate them.

Maternal and child health have far exceeded the national norms for the teenage group. Maternal complications during pregnancy have been virtually non-existent, and the percentage of low birth weight infants has been significantly lower than the national average. These facts have attracted much attention from both educators and medical professionals. An extensive blood studies program, conducted by Dr. Christian Hansen and Dr. Myrtle Brown, was directly related to the statistics regarding low birth weight infants. Further relating to these statistics, a research project has been granted by the State Department of Education to follow the students and their babies. Particular attention will be devoted to those children who are now entering our school system.

The Consortium on Schoolage Parents which had been primarily concerned with health has now become involved in the educational aspect. Staff members of the producer district have attended and hosted meetings; it was this involvement which encouraged awareness and interest of the educational factor.

Many requests come in from adjoining districts to admit students to program on a tuition basis. It may be that some thought should be given to a county facility.

INDIVIDUALIZED LANGUAGE ARTS: DIAGNOSIS, PRESCRIPTION, & EVALUATION, Weehawken, N.J.
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74
Validated, 1973

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:		
	1972-73	$ 2,500
	1973-74	8,925
	1974-75	24,500
		$35,925

PROGRAMS IN USE IN WEEHAWKEN AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

4	schools
57	teachers, grade 1-12
2,300	students

The program has expanded from its original site at one school and is completely funded by the Board of Education.

STATEWIDE DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

1972-73	Teachers trained	33	
	Administrators trained	6	
	Adopter districts	8	
	Students involved in program	3,394	
1973-74	Teachers trained	87	
	Administrators trained	13	
	Adopter districts (new)	4	
	Students involved in program	2,175	
1974-75	Projections:	N.J.	Out of State
	Teachers to be trained	25	50
	Administrators to be trained	5	5
	Adopter districts	5	10
	Students to be involved in program	625	1,250

TOTALS FOR DISSEMINATION IMPACT

1972-73, 1973-74		projected cumulative figures 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75
Adopter districts	12	27
Students in program	5,569	7,444
Teachers trained	120	195
Administrators trained	18	28

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $5.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $2,500

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	6,000 copies (printed, winter 1972)
Resource Manual	Existing copies used

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Approximately 6 introductory presentations to approximately 325 persons:

N.J. School Board Assoc. Convention, October, 1972, roundtable discussion.

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshow, October, 1972.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, November, 1972.

N.J.E.A., Good Ideas Conference, March, 1973.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-Northwest workshop, March, 1973.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, April, 1973

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential elements of the project:

1. Setting up local objectives
2. Diagnosis: Taking periodic writing samples
3. Prescription: Using techniques
4. Evaluation: Using class checklists
   Using cumulative writing folders
5. Using program in content and skill areas
   (e.g., science, reading, etc.)
6. Conducting in-service training
   Providing in-service supervision
   Developing in-service materials
   (tapes, sample lesson plans, resource manuals)

Training in these elements was offered by three members of the project staff in a five day twenty-five hour workshop, August, 1973, EIC-NW.

District	Schools	No. of teachers and grades taught	No. of Administrators
Hawthorne	4	5; gr. 1,2,3	1
Bridgewater-Raritan	data incomplete	4; gr. 3,5	1 (Director, District Instructional Center)
Tewsbury Township	data incomplete	2; gr. 2	
Chatsworth	1	2; gr. 2	
East Orange	1	Reading Resource Teacher	
Holland Township	1	2; gr. 5,7	
Piscataway	2	2; gr. 4,5	2 - Principals Director of Teacher Resource Svc. Admin. Assistant
Rahway	1	2; gr. 5,6	
Salem	data incomplete	2; gr. 4,5,7	
Scotch Plains	data incomplete	4; gr. 4,9	
West Orange	data incomplete	7; gr. 1-6	1 - Principal
TALS: 11		33; gr. 1-9	6

Consultation services were provided to staff of these districts upon request during the following school year:

Piscataway: five consultation visits

Salem: one consultation visit; some staff members attended one or more of the three awareness workshops that were given in 1973-74

Scotch Plains: one consultation visit

Bridgewater-Raritan: one consultation visit

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $8,925

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Teacher's Resource Manual	500	copies to be sold at $12.50 ea.
Prospectus	500	copies
Technical Brief, reprinted	5,000	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Approximately 10 introductory presentations to approximately 300 persons:

EIC-South, three awareness presentations: Aug., '73, Oct., '73, Jan., '74

NJEA, Good Ideas Conference, April, '74

Presentations to districts:

Wycoff
Newton
Highbridge
Rahway
Woodbridge
South Orange - Maplewood

General followup to the summer workshop; Oct., '73, EIC-NW

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential elements of the program:

1. Setting up local objectives
2. Diagnosis: Taking periodic writing samples
   Using diagnostic grid sheet
3. Prescription: Using techniques
4. Evaluation: Using class checklists
   Using cumulative writing folders
5. Using program in content and skill areas
   (e.g., science, reading, etc.)
6. Conducting in-service training
   Providing in-service supervision
   Developing in-service materials
   (tapes, sample lesson plans, resource materials)

Training in the above elements of the program was provided in a four day, twenty-hour workshop at Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, summer 1974. Participants in the training program are listed below:

District	Schools	No. of teachers and grades taught	No. of Administrators
Bridgewater-Raritan	7	9; gr. 1,3,4,6,7,8	1 - Language Arts Supervisor
East Orange	1 public 1 non-public	8; gr. 1-2	
Hampton	1	4; primary, 3-8	1 - Superintendent
Hawthorne	6	11; gr. 2-5	1 - Title I
High Bridge	1	2; gr. 1-3	1 - Principal
Holland	1	1; gr. 7	
Newton	1	5; gr. 2-5	1 - Principal
Piscataway	data incomplete	6; gr. 3-5	1- Director of Teacher Resource Svcs.
Salem	data incomplete	2;	1 - Elementary Coordinator

District	Schools	No. of teachers and grades taught	No. of Administrators
Scotch Plains-Fanwood	data incomplete	9; gr. 2,7,8,9	1 - Director, Language Arts
South Orange-Maplewood	2	6; gr. 1-5	1 - Principal
Tewksbury	1	5; gr. 3-5	1 - Principal
West Orange	1	9; gr. 1,3,4,5,6	1 - Principal 1 - Librarian
Wyckoff	data incomplete	9; gr. 3-5	1 - Dir. of Instruction
Sandyston-Walpack	1	1; gr. 3	
TALS:	15	87; gr. 1-9	

SUMMARY OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM REPLICATED

These data are summarized from evaluation questionnaires completed in May, 1974 by representatives of the districts trained in 1972-73.

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TEACHERS: # & grade	ELEMENTS REPLICATED										STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
			Setting up local objectives	Diagnosis: Taking periodic writing samples	Using diagnostic grid sheet	Prescription: Using techniques	Evaluation: Using class checklists	Using cumulative writing folders	Using program in content & skill areas (e.g., science, reading, etc.)	Conducting in-service training	Providing in-service supervision	Developing in-service materials (tapes, sample lesson plans, resource materials)	
Hawthorne	Franklin	2; gr. 2		X		X	X		X			X	20
	Jefferson	2; gr. 1,2	X	X		X			X			X	37
	Lincoln	1; gr. 3											19
	Washington	1; gr. 1	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	17
	Roosevelt	2; gr. 1,3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	48
Tewksbury Township	Sawmill	2; gr. 2	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	42
Bridgewater -Raritan	Crim Road	1; gr. 1		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	28
	Bradley	2; gr. 2		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	35
West Orange	Eagle Rock	14; gr. K-6	10*	10	9	8	8	6	8	7	6	1	330

* Numbers refer to the number of teachers using the technique.

SUMMARY OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM REPLICATED

These data are summarized from evaluation questionnaires completed in May, 1974 by representatives of the districts trained in 1972-73.

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TEACHERS: # & grade	ELEMENTS REPLICATED										STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
			Setting up local objectives	Diagnosis: Taking periodic writing samples	Using diagnostic grid sheet	Prescription: Using techniques	Evaluation: Using class checklists	Using cumulative writing folders	Using program in content & skill areas (e.g., science, reading, etc.)	Conducting in-service training	Providing in-service supervision	Developing in-service materials (tapes, sample lesson plans, resource materials)	
Salem * City	John Fenwick	70; gr. K-12											1900
	Middle School												
	Salem High												
Scotch Plains - Fanwood	Park Jr. H.S.	3; gr. 7-9	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	250
Holland Township	Holland Twp.	1; gr. 7	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	92
Piscataway*	Arbor	2; gr. 2,4/5											50
	Schor	3; gr. 6											75
	Eisenhower	2; gr. 1											100
	Fellowship Farm	4; gr. 1-3											50

* In response to the evaluation questionnaire the project coordinator did not ask teachers to indicate the essential elements that they were using.

SUMMARY OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM REPLICATED

These data are summarized from evaluation questionnaires completed in May, 1974 by representatives of the districts trained in 1972-73.

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	TEACHERS: # & grade	ELEMENTS REPLICATED										STUDENTS IN PROGRAM
			Setting up local objectives	Diagnosis: Taking periodic writing samples	Using diagnostic grid sheet	Prescription: Using techniques	Evaluation: Using class checklists	Using cumulative writing folders	Using program in content & skill areas (e.g., science, reading, etc.)	Conducting in-service training	Providing in-service supervision	Developing in-service materials (tapes, sample lesson plans, resource materials)	
Piscateway (cont.d)	New Market	2; gr. 1-3											50
	King	4; gr. 1, 2,4,5											100
	Grandview	3; gr. 1, 2,4											75
	Randolphville	3; gr. 2, 3,4 spec. ed.											75
TOTALS:	22	124; gr. K-12											3,394

INTERNING FOR LEARNING, Cape May County, New Jersey
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:		
	1972-73	$20,000
	1973-74	93,772
	1974-75	84,159
		$197,931

PROGRAM USE IN CAPE MAY COUNTY AS OF JUNE, 1974:

14	districts
5	nonpublic schools
95	teachers (of 112 trained)
2,375	students

Continued training is available to county educators as a result of the financial contributions of thirteen Boards of Education, plus that of staff time of members of the Cape May County Superintendent's Office.

DISSEMINATION OUTSIDE CAPE MAY COUNTY:

1972-73	Adopter districts	6	Students in program	450
	Teachers trained	31	Administrators trained	2
1973-74	Adopter districts	23	Students in program	2,275
	Teachers trained	91	Administrators trained	3
1974-75	Projections:			
	Adopter districts	24	Students in program	2,500
	Teachers trained	100	Administrators trained	24

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES SPONSORED BY TURN-KEY TRAINING PROGRAMS:

1972-73	Districts with turn-key training programs	4
	Teachers trained through turn-key programs	12
	Students in program	300
1973-74	Satellite turn-key training centers established to serve Ocean and Atlantic Counties	2
	Adopter districts	15
	Teachers trained	33
	Students in program	825
1974-75	Projections for the project's satellite centers in Atlantic, Cumberland, Ocean and Salem counties:	

	Adopter districts	35	Students in program	2,875
	Teachers trained	115	Administrators trained	42

TOTALS:

1972-73, 1973-74	project	turn-key training programs	projected cumulative figures 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75 project	turn-key training programs
Adopter districts	29	6	53	9
Students in program	2,725	1,125	5,350	4,000
Teachers trained	122	45	222	160
Administrators trained	5	0	29	42

Projected dissemination cost per student in the program over a three year period, $28. This cost includes the Title III funding awarded to three county offices in 1974-75 since their contribution to the estimate of the total dissemination impact is substantial.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $20,000

MATERIALS PREPARED

Slide-tape introduction to the program as it exists in Cape May County.

Technical Brief 8,000 copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project: 400 (school year)
200 (summer '73 workshop)

Introductory presentations to approximately 500 persons:

N.J. School Board Assoc. Convention, October, 1972, roundtable discussion.

Ocean County Administrators Roundtable, October, 1972

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshop, October, 1972.

N.J. School Administrators Workshop, November, 1972.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, November, 1972.

Parochial Teachers Workshop, Margate, N.J., November, 1972.

N.J. ASCD, April, 1973.

PTA Presentations (5) throughout year, 1972-73.

Written inquiries about the program

50 from New Jersey

5 from other states

TRAINING OFFERED

Essential Elements of the Program:

1. Use of a classroom management procedure based upon an analysis of students' skills in reading and mathematics and the organization of four simultaneous activities: direct instruction, follow-up, learning stations/centers, and pursuit of special interests.

2. Establishment of turn-key training program to train other teachers in the district in the "Interning..." manner.

3. Establishment of a steering committee to guide program's use including turn-key training.

Training for District Staff:

Teachers and administrators receive training in #1 and #2 (above) in four days in Cape May County that include internship in the classrooms of experienced teachers. A fifth day is spent by trainees and project staff in the consumer district rearranging, as required, the classrooms of trainees.

Training summary: Thirty-one teachers from nine districts outside of Cape May County were trained. Teachers, schools, and districts are listed on the following pages.

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

1972 - 1973

ATLANTIC COUNTY

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Brigantine	Brigantine North	Grace Cairns	5th	3/26 - 30/1973
Brigantine	Brigantine North	Nancy Rhodes	5th	3/26 - 30/1973
Brigantine	Brigantine Central	Sheila Brayer	2nd	3/26 - 30/1973
Brigantine	Brigantine Central	Linda Schaeffer	1st	3/26 - 30/1973
Brigantine	Brigantine Central	Jim Dansey	4th	3/26 - 30/1973

BERGEN COUNTY

Glen Rock	Byrd Elementary	Ken Johnson	6th	2/5 - 9/1973
Glen Rock	Central Elementary	Marie Haffey	3rd	2/5 - 9/1973
Glen Rock	Colman Elementary	Joel Shumer	6th	2/5 - 9/1973
Glen Rock	Hamilton Elementary	J. VanDelden	5th	2/5 - 9/1973

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

Maurice River	Little Port Elizabeth	Judy Thomas	3rd	2/26 - 3/2/1973
Maurice River	Maurice River Elem.	Paul Elia	6th	2/26 - 3/2/1973
Stow Creek Twp.	Stow Creek Elementary	Pam Davis	2nd	2/26 - 3/2/1973
Stow Creek Twp.	Stow Creek Elementary	Linda Varesio	4th	2/26 - 3/2/1973

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Spotswood	Appleby Elementary	June Kopcho	1st	3/26 - 30/1973
Spotswood	Appleby Elementary	Pat Slawinski	2nd	3/26 - 30/1973
Spotswood	Appleby Elementary	Beth Fornero	3rd	3/26 - 30/1973
Spotswood	Schoenly Elementary	Nell Burgeson	1st	3/26 - 30/1973

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

Continued

1972 - 1973

OCEAN COUNTY

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Union Township	Barnegat Elementary	Dorothea Pinto	4th	3/5 - 9/1973
Union Township	Barnegat Elementary	John Flamma	6th	3/5 - 9/1973
Tuckerton	Tuckerton Elementary	Evelyn Mangold	2nd	1/15 - 18/1973
Tuckerton	Tuckerton Elementary	Marianne Koehler	5th	1/15 - 18/1973
Jackson Township	Brookwood Elementary	Cora Jones	1st	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Brookwood Elementary	Eleanor Luehrs	5th	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Holman Elementary	Marlene Tedesco	3rd	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Holman Elementary	Mary Black	5th	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Johnson Elementary	Lynn Simmons	3rd	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Johnson Elementary	Judy Ecks	5th	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Switlik Elementary	Janet Walter	2nd	12/4 - 8/1972
Jackson Township	Switlik Elementary	Leslie Larrabee	3rd	12/4 - 8/1972

SALEM COUNTY

Penns Grove	Lafayette-Pershing	Ann Peak	3rd	2/26 - 3/2/1973
Penns Grove	Lafayette-Pershing	Mary A. Minton	3rd	2/26 - 3/2/1973

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS REPLICATED

INTERNING FOR LEARNING
1972-73

The following information is based on the response to an evaluation questionnaire of representatives of six of the nine districts whose staffs were trained.

District	Use of the classroom management procedure: number of teachers	Establishment of turn-key training program: number of teachers trained	Establishment of a steering committee to guide program's use including turn-key training	OTHER: Number of teachers who adopted aspects of the program without formal training
Brigantine Central	2	none	no	18
Glen Rock	4	3	yes	5
Maurice River	2	none	no	none
Tuckerton	2	3	yes	3
Jackson Twp.	6	2	no	17
Pennsgrove	2	4	no	none
No Response:	Brigantine North School Stow Creek Spotswood		Jackson Township, Brookwood School Barnegat Elementary, Union Township	

TOTALS:

6 districts	18 teachers	4 established 12 teachers trained	2 established	4 districts 53 teachers

Estimate of the number of students whose teachers are using Interning for Learning based upon 25 students per teacher: 750

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $93,772

MATERIALS PREPARED

Final Report/Overview Brochure	10,000	copies
Learning Stations and Centers, first edition	800	copies (to be sold at $1 ea.)
Challenge for Change	1,000	copies (to be sold at $2 ea.)
Overview filmstrip/tape	150	copies
Prototype evaluation design for adopters	50	copies
Sets of overhead transparencies for use by turn-key trainers		

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project site 500 (school year)
1,000 (summer workshop)

Introductory presentations to approximately 1,500 persons:

Cape May -Atlantic Counties Principal Assoc., October, 1973.

Department of Education: OPD and Office of Equal Educational Opportunity; two workshops for districts with integration plans, Glassboro and Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, Sepbember, October 1973.

Department of Education workshop for administrators in cooperation with the N.J. School Administrators Assoc., East Brunswick, October, 1973.

Educational Improvement South: September, 1973 two days; December, 1973, two days.

Department of Education: Right to Read workshops:
N.J. Right to Read Directors, April, 1974, June, 1974.
Right to Read Coordinators: Salem, Burlington, Camden and Ocean Counties.

ASCD; N.J. State Conference, November, 1973.

N.J.E.A. Convention, November, 1973, one-hour presentation.

Phi Delta Kappa, N.J. Conference, March, 1974.

N.J.E.A. Good Ideas Conference, April, 1974, one-hour presentation.

Reading Teachers Conference of South Jersey, March, 1974.

Temple University Principals' Seminar, April, 1974.

Presentations made in the following districts

Atco	Downe Township	Linwood
Belhaven School	Elsinboro	Passaic
Bridgeton	Hackensack	Woodbury Heights
Burlington County Vocational School	Haddon Township	

Written inquiries about the program

150 from New Jersey

50 from other states

Materials sold at cost

Item		Cost	Total Receipts
Challenge for Change	1,000 copies	$2	$2,000
Learning Stations and Centers (first edition)	800 copies	$1	$800
		TOTAL:	$2,800

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential Elements of the Program:

1. Use of a classroom management procedure based upon an analysis of students' skills in reading and mathematics and the organization of four simultaneous activities: direct instruction, follow-up, learning stations/centers, and pursuit of special interests.

2. Establishment of turn-key training program to train other teachers in the district in the "Interning..." manner.

3. Establishment of a steering committee to guide program's use including turn-key training.

Training for District Staff:

Teachers and administrators receive training in #1 and #2 (above) in four days in Cape May County that include internship in the classrooms of experienced teachers. A fifth day is spent by trainees and project staff in the consumer district rearranging, as required, the classrooms of trainees.

Training for County Superintendent Office Staffs:

Training of three to five days is offered in the essential elements of the program with special emphasis on the organization of countywide training. Internship opportunities within a county are provided by teachers originally trained by the Interning for Learning staff who use the program successfully.

Consultation:

In the summer, 1974, consultation was available during a five week period, July 8 through August 9, to all interested educators on any aspect of Interning for Learning at two sites: Resource Center, Rio Grande; Resource Center, Upper Township.

TRAINING RENDERED

Ninety-one teachers and 3 administrators from 23 New Jersey districts outside of Cape May County received five days of training in the program's essential elements. Those trained are listed on the following pages.

Eight Helping Teachers from 4 County Superintendent's Offices (Atlantic, Cumberland, Ocean, and Salem counties) received three to five days of training each. Training programs were:

Ocean County:	September, 1973; December 11-12, 1973; March 15, 19, 1973
Atlantic County:	October, 1973; April, 1974

Approximately 1,000 educators, primarily teachers, visited two Resource Center sites in Cape May County during the summer, 1974 to work on various aspects of Interning for Learning with consultation help available if requested. This activity supported the training rendered in 1973-74 as well as providing introductory information to visitors previously unacquainted with the program.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS REPLICATED

At this date, February, 1975, evaluation questionnaires have not yet been returned by the districts whose staffs were trained in 1973-74 to verify the replication of the program's essential elements.

The Ocean County Superintendent's staff reports that in 1973-74 twenty-seven teachers from 12 districts in Ocean County were trained in a five day Interning for Learning program by the County Office Helping Teachers. Classroom teachers providing the internship opportunities were those originally trained by the project staff in Cape May county. Followup consultation was provided by the Ocean County staff.

The Atlantic County Superintendent's staff reports that in 1973-74, six teachers in 3 districts were trained in a five day training program by the Atlantic County Helping Teacher. Classroom teachers providing the internship opportunities were those originally trained by the project staff in Cape May county. Followup consultation was provided by the Atlantic County staff.

As a result of the two county wide turn-key training programs noted above a total of 33 teachers in 15 districts were trained. This brought approximately 825 students into the program. Since these programs were put into operation the Cape May staff refers all applicants for training from these two counties to their respective County Superintendent's Office.

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

1973 - 1974

ATLANTIC COUNTY

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Galloway Twp.	Pomona Elementary	Bonnie Schwarz	3rd	10/29-11/1/1973
Galloway Twp.	Pomona Elementary	Carlene P. Abbott	3rd	10/29-11/1/1973
Northfield	Mill Road Elementary	Joyce Conley	2nd	10/29-11/1/1973
Northfield	Kresge Elementary	Michaele Whitehead	3rd	10/29-11/1/1973

BERGEN COUNTY

Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Marilyn Barry	4th	3/4 - 8/1974
Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Barbara McEwan	1st	3/4 - 8/1974
Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Harriet Wells	3rd	3/4 - 8/1974
Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Constance Mantz	1st	4/1 - 5/1974
Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Linda Tobin	2nd	4/1 - 5/1974
Haworth	Haworth Elementary	Barbara Grubman	4th	4/1 - 5/1974

BURLINGTON COUNTY

Cinnaminson	New Albany	Christine Czarniecky	1st	2/25-3/1/1974
Cinnaminson	New Albany	Harriet Speiser	1st	2/25-3/1/1974
Cinnaminson	Rush	Toni Agunsday	1st	2/25-3/1/1974
Cinnaminson	Rush	Avis Belford	2nd	2/25-3/1/1974
Cinnaminson	Memorial	Anne Hart	3rd	2/25-3/1/1974
Cinnaminson	Memorial-Strabel	Pat Sieler	5th	2/25-3/1/1974

CAMDEN COUNTY

Haddon Heights	Atlantic Avenue	Mary Ann Pincus	3rd	4/1 - 5/1974
Haddon Heights	Atlantic Avenue	Gloria Giordano	1st	4/1 - 5/1974

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

Continued

1973 - 1974

Camden County, Continued

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Barrington	Culbertson	Joan Underkuffler	1st	4/1 - 5/1974
Barrington	Culbertson	Florence Rossman	4th	4/1 - 5/1974
Barrington	Avon	Dorothy Malehorn	2nd	4/1 - 5/1974
Barrington	Avon	Mildred Martin	3rd	4/1 - 5/1974
Gloucester Twp.	Chews	Carol Mello	3rd	4/1 - 5/1974
Gloucester Twp.	Chews	Giordana Serafini	3rd	4/1 - 5/1974

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

Upper Deerfield	Seabrook South	Reet Voorand	5th	10/1 - 5/1973
Upper Deerfield	Seabrook North	Annette Maurer	3rd	10/1 - 5/1973
Greenwich Twp.	Morris Goodwin	Carol Brooks	5th	1/28 - 2/1/1974
Greenwich Twp.	Morris Goodwin	Gladys Trusty	6th	1/28 - 2/1/1974
Greenwich Twp.	Morris Goodwin	Roseanne Foster	2nd	1/28 - 2/1/1974
Cedarville	Myron L. Powell	Marie Cobb	1st	2/4 - 8/1974
Cedarville	Myron L. Powell	Jane Morris	1st	2/4 - 8/1974
Cedarville	Myron L. Powell	Elva Morris	4th	2/25 - 3/1/1974
Cedarville	Myron L. Powell	Elizabeth Nardelli	6th	2/25 - 3/1/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Hopewell Elementary	Nancy Rammell	2nd	2/4 - 8/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Hopewell Elementary	Patrick McAllister	4th	2/4 - 8/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Shiloh Elementary	Mildred Schaible	2nd	2/4 - 8/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Shiloh Elementary	Beatrice Hooks	Spec.Ed.	2/4 - 8/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Hopewell Elementary	Eileen Foster	7th	2/25 - 3/1/1974
Hopewell Twp.	Hopewell Elementary	Gladys Searle	5th	2/25 - 3/1/1974
Downe Twp.	Downe Twp. Elementary	Belva Webb	4th	2/25 - 3/1/1974
Downe Twp.	Downe Twp. Elementary	Lois Fitale	6th	2/25 - 3/1/1974

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

Continued

1973 - 1974

Cumberland County, Continued

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Commercial Twp.	Port Norris Elementary	Martha Rimback	2nd	3/4 - 8/1974
Commercial Twp.	Port Norris Elementary	JoAnne Boyce	5th	3/4 - 8/1974
Bridgeton	Indian Avenue	Anja Hoglund	1st	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Indian Avenue	Rita Katsotis	Spec.Ed.	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Irving Avenue	Angelina Higbee	3rd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Irving Avenue	Joyce Hursey	2nd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Cherry Street	Rebecca Guess	2nd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Cherry Street	Linda Hayes	3rd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Pearl Street	Barbara Elbirn	2nd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Pearl Street	Orinda Ward	2nd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Quarter Mile Lane	Shirley Gossiaux	1st	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Quarter Mile Lane	Stacey DeJohn	1st	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Vine Street	Mildred Spoltore	4th	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	Vine Street	Judy Dallago	3rd	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	West Avenue	Gayle Furushima	1st	4/22 - 26/1974
Bridgeton	West Avenue	Pat Bacon	Kd.	4/22 - 26/1974
		HUDSON COUNTY		
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #2	Barbara Angelo	1st	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #2	Patricia Noonan	Spec.Ed.	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #2	Kathleen McFeeley	3rd	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #6	Marcella Gruber	3rd	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #25	Mercedes McCormick	5th	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #33	Eleanor Bower	Kd.	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #33	Rosalie Newell	Kd.	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #37	Nancy Filak	8th	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #41	David James	6th	3/11 - 15/1974
Jersey City	J.C. Elementary #41	Gerard Russoniello	7th	3/11 - 15/1974

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

1973 - 1974

MERCER COUNTY

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Hamilton Twp.	Yardville	Anita Burke	2nd	3/18 - 22/1974
Hamilton Twp.	Yardville	Elma Turp	3rd	3/18 - 22/1974
Hamilton Twp.	Sunnybrae	Jacqueline Jones	4th	3/18 - 22/1974
Hamilton Twp.	Sunnybrae	Ellen Hamilton	4th	3/18 - 22/1974

MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Sayreville	Selover	John Earles	5th	3/25 - 30/1974
Sayreville	Selover	Trudy Kebzierski	2nd	3/25 - 30/1974
Sayreville	Arleth	Florence Geleziler	6th	3/25 - 30/1974
Sayreville	Arleth	Kathleen Mataranglo	1st	3/25 - 30/1974

MONMOUTH COUNTY

Howell Twp.	Land O'Pines	Jill Buller	2nd	3/18 - 22/1974
Howell Twp.	Aldrich	Marjorie Moore	2nd	3/18 - 22/1974

SALEM COUNTY

Alloway Twp.	Alloway Elementary	Kitty Mulligan	1st	10/8 - 12/1973
Alloway Twp.	Alloway Elementary	Maria Kauffman	2nd	10/8 - 12/1973
Elsinboro Twp.	Elsinboro Elementary	Priscilla Coles	1st	10/22 - 26/1973
Elsinboro Twp.	Elsinboro Elementary	Valentine Carabin	2nd	10/22 - 26/1973
Elsinboro Twp.	Elsinboro Elementary	Elizabeth Hires	3rd	10/22 - 26/1973
Elsinboro Twp.	Elsinboro Elementary	Frances Morris	4th	10/22 - 26/1973
Quinton Twp.	Quinton Elementary	June Moore	3rd	11/26 - 30/1973
Quinton Twp.	Quinton Elementary	Marti West	4th	11/26 - 30/1973

OUT-OF-COUNTY TEACHERS TRAINED IN CAPE MAY COUNTY

1973 - 1974

Continued

Salem County, Continued

District	School	Teachers	Grade Level	Dates
Oldmans Twp.	Fedricktown	Nancy Kohler	5th	3/18 - 22/1974
Oldmans Twp.	Fedricktown	Barbara Kotch	3rd	3/18 - 22/1974
		UNION COUNTY		
Linden	Myles J. McManus	Valerie Malo	7th	3/25 - 30/1974
Linden	Myles J. McManus	David Malo	7th	3/25 - 30/1974
Linden	Joseph E. Soehl	Anthony Cataline	7th	3/25 - 30/1974
Linden	Joseph E. Soehl	Stephen Krysiak	7th	3/25 - 30/1974

LEARNING CENTER: INTEGRATED ALTERNATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION, Winslow, N.J.
(Validated 1973)

DISSEMINATION PROPOSAL: 1973-74 BUDGET: $2,620

PROGRAM IN USE IN WINSLOW:

Funds are provided by the Winslow Board of Education.	3	schools
	8	teachers
	100	students

The program is fully supported by the Winslow Board of Education.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION IMPACT AND COST:

Adopter districts	2
Teachers trained	62
Administrators trained	7
Others trained	9
Students in program in adopter districts	81

Average dissemination cost per student, $33.

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	5,000	copies
Implementation Manual	250	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Approximately 50 visitors to project.

Approximately 1,000 persons attended orientation prerentations:

Project sponsored conference, March, 1973.

Atlantic County Inservice Day, October, 1973.

N.J.E.A. Convention, November, 1973, one hour presentation.

Phi Delta Kappa, March, 1974.

Written inquiries about project

from New Jersey	50
from out of state	155

TRAINING PROVIDED

Essential elements of the program in which training is provided:

1. Use of the organizational structure of assigning learning disabled students to learning activities in a special class as well as a regular class.

2. Ongoing evaluation of student progress and adjustment of student schedules as required.

Training rendered:

Two three-day, 18 hour workshops in the essential elements were held for representatives of two consumer districts. Two followup consultations will be provided in 1974-75.

Districts represented	Teachers trained	Administrators trained	Students in Program
Hamilton Township	53	3	52
Pleasantville	9	4	29
TOTALS:	62	7	81

The consumer districts have received ESEA, Title III consumer grants for 1974-75 and will submit to the Office of Program Development evaluations of their adoptions in June, 1975.

PROJECT LEM: LEARNING EXPERIENCE MODULE, Hackensack, New Jersey
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74
(Validated, 1973)

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:

1972-73:	$26,482	
1973-74:	12,279	
1974-75:	35,939	(state funds)
	10,000	(Title III, section 306 funds)
	$70,170	

PROGRAM USE IN HACKENSACK AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

4 schools, grades 2-8
50 teachers
4 administrators
1,250 students

The program in Hackensack has expanded from the original site of one school and is fully funded by the Board of Education.

STATEWIDE DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

1972-73

Adopter districts	4	Students in program	1,100
Teachers trained	48	Administrators trained	5
Teachers using program (3 or more essential elements)	45		

All four districts continued program.

1973-74

New Adopter districts	3	Students in program	292
Teachers trained	22	Administrators trained	4
New Teachers using program	17		

Two of three districts will continue program.

1974-75 Projections for in-state impact:

New Adopter districts	3	Students to be in program	750
Teachers to be trained	30	Administrators to be trained	3

Projections for out-of-state impact:

Adopter districts	2	Students in program	500
Teachers to be trained	20	Administrators to be trained	2

TOTALS FOR DISSEMINATION IMPACT

	1972-73, 1973-74	projected cumulative figures 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75
Adopter districts	6	11
Students in program	1,392	2,642
Teachers trained	70	120
Administrators	9	14

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $27.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $26,482

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	5,000 copies (printed, winter 1972)
Overview and Evaluation	5,000 copies
Environment and Space Utilization	5,000 copies
Organization and Curriculum	5,000 copies
Overview filmstrip/tape	25 copies
Curriculum and Organization of LEM filmstrip/tape	25 copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 800

Approximately 24 introductory presentations to approximately 1,300 persons.

Presentations

ED/Fair '73, Washington, D.C., May 9-11, 1973, Mr. Kaminsky and Mrs. E. Russo - An exhibit and three (3) formal presentations to an audience of educators from the fifty (50) states. The LEM Project received an award from Dr. Carl Marburger.

Educational Improvement Center, Cedar Knolls, N. J., November 8, 1972. Mrs. E. Russo, Mrs. J. Kenefick, Mrs. M. Ritscher - ninety (90) people present.

Educational Improvement Center, Glassboro, N. J., November 9, 1972. Mrs. E. Russo, Mr. B. Kaminsky - twenty-two people present.

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, N. J., December 4, 1972. Mrs. E. Russo - thirty-four (34) students and professors attended.

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, N. J., March 19, 1973. Mr. B. Kaminsky - thirty (30) people attended.

Hackensack Board of Education, Hillers School, Hackensack, N. J., November 6, 1972, Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mrs. E. Russo, Mr. A. M. Marseglia, Mrs. G. Fisher.

Hanover Professional Workshop, Hanover, N. J., March 29, 1973, Mrs. J. Kenefick, one hundred fifty (150) people attended.

Hoboken Public Schools, Hoboken, N. J., May 9, 1973, Mrs. J. Tetens - thrity (30) people attended.

Hunterdon County Teachers' Workshop, Flemington, N. J., December 4, 1972, Mrs. C. Colella, Mrs. R. Allen - forty (40) people attended.

Lakehurst Elementary School, Lakehurst, N. J., March 16, 1973 - Mrs. J. Kenefick, Mr. L. Kessler, fifty (50) people attended.

Maplewood-South Orange Teachers Workshop, Marshall School, Maplewood, N. J., January 29, 1973, Mrs. E. Russo - eighteen (18) people attended.

Maplewood-South Orange P. T. A., Maplewood, N. J., November 16, 1972, Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mrs. K. Sweeney, Mrs. A. DeLuca, Mrs. H. Thiel - eighty (80) people attended.

Memorial School P. T. O., Maywood, N. J., January 11, 1973, Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mrs. T. Tetens - fifty (50) people attended.

Memorial School P. T. O., Paramus, N. J., October 25, 1972, Mrs. E. Wilson, Mrs. J. D'Ambrosio - fifty-five (55) people attended.

Montclair State College, Montclair, N. J., June 27, 1973, Mrs. J. Kenefick - thirty-five (35) people attended.

National Association of Elementary School Principals, Convention Booth, April 16, 1973, Detroit, Michigan - Mrs. E. Russo.

N. J. E. A. Good Ideas Conference, Monmouth State College, March 3, 1973, Mrs. E. Russo - two hundred fifty (250) people attended.

N. J. Reading Teachers' Conference, East Brunswick, N. J., February 3, 1973, Mrs. E. Russo - sixty-five (65) people attended.

N. J. School Administrators Workshop, New Brunswick, N. J., November 29, 1972, Mrs. E. Russo, Mr. B. Kaminsky - seventy (70) people attended.

New Milford Parent Group, New Milford, N. J., March 20, 1973, Mrs. E. Blahut, Mrs. J. Kenefick - fifty (50) people attended.

Office of Equal Opportunity, Trenton, N. J., February 15, 1973, Mrs. E. Russo, Mr. B. Kaminsky - sixty (60) people attended.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Verona Public Schools, Professional Staff Workshop, Verona, N. J., April 2, 1973, Mr. J. D'Ambrosio, Mrs. A. Small - thirty (30) people attended.

William Paterson College, Wayne, N. J., Mrs. C. Colella, Mrs. K. Sweeney - thirty-five (35) people attended.

William Paterson College, Wayne, N. J., July 25, 1973, Mrs. C. Colella - thirty (30) people attended.

Articles describing the project

Four articles in New Jersey newspapers

"New Structures for New Programs", The Title III Quarterly, National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, Spring, 1973, p. 18.

"Project LEM", Notes, Office of Equal Educational Opportunity, New Jersey Department of Education.

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential Elements of the Program:

Teacher teams
Differentiated staffing pattern
Citizens Advisory Council
Multi-aged groupings
Facilities modification
Non-graded instructional approach
Basic skills groupings by levels
LEM scheduling pattern
Team approach to implementing units of instruction

Training for District Staff:

Training in the above project components occurred in five consecutive half-day periods during the summer, 1973 at Hillers Elementary School, Hackensack, which is the original LEM site. Training is conducted by the LEM teaching staff, the principal of Hillers School, and the project director.

Followup Consultation:

Two to three followup consultations by a member of the LEM staff are recommended for the school year following the training.

Training Summary:

48 teachers and 5 administrators from 5 districts were trained. See listing below. Four of the districts submitted evaluations of the training. See results on the following pages.

Districts whose staffs received training in LEM

Oakland	Manito School	5 teachers gr. 2-5	1 administrator (principal)
	Dogwood Hill School	7 teachers gr. 1-5	
	Heights School	3 teachers gr. 4	
Maplewood-South Orange	Marshall School	5 teachers gr. 5-6	1 administrator (principal)
Freehold	Intermediate School	12 teachers gr. 5-6	1 administrator
Jersey City	Open Classroom Pilot Project representing schools #2, 6, 25, 33, 37, 41	12 teachers gr. K-8	1 administrator (1 day only)
Verona	F.N. Brown School	4 teachers gr. 3-4	1 administrator
TOTALS			
5 districts	12 schools	48 teachers gr. K-8	5 administrators

LEM WORKSHOP EVALUATION

	Successful	Sufficient	Lacking
Philosophy and goals of open education.			
Verona	5	0	0
Jersey City	9	0	0
Freehold	9	2	0
Oakland	13	2	0
Your project's objectives.			
Verona	3	1	0
Jersey City	7	0	0
Freehold	8	2	0
Oakland	9	6	0
Responsibilities of staff.			
Verona	4	1	0
Jersey City	9	0	0
Freehold	11	0	0
Oakland	14	1	0
Formation of groups.			
Verona	1	0	0
Jersey City	6	2	0
Freehold	10	1	0
Oakland	8	7	0

Scheduling of activities.			
Verona	3	1	0
Jersey City	7	1	0
Freehold	9	2	0
Oakland	6	8	1
	Successful	Sufficient	Lacking
Evaluation procedure.			
Verona	1	4	0
Jersey City	7	2	0
Freehold	6	4	1
Oakland	7	6	1
Parent Involvement.			
Verona	1	4	0
Jersey City	9	0	0
Freehold	8	3	0
Oakland	11	4	0
Curriculum content.			
Verona	2	3	0
Jersey City	8	0	0
Freehold	6	5	0
Oakland	12	3	0
Individualized learning techniques.			
Verona	5	0	0
Jersey City	7	1	0
Freehold	6	4	1
Oakland	10	4	1
Development of wholesome learning environment.			
Verona	5	0	0
Jersey City	8	1	0
Freehold	8	3	0
Oakland	13	2	0
Team concerns.			
Verona	4	1	0
Jersey City	3	0	0
Freehold	9	1	0
Oakland	14	1	0

Consultation Summary:

LEM staff rendered the following consultations to districts trained in the summer, 1973. The consultation services were provided during the 1973-74 school year.

Freehold

One full day workshop on implementation of program and use of materials by three members of the LEM staff.
One full day on-site consultation by LEM Project Director.

Maplewood/South Orange

One full day consultation provided by member of LEM staff.

One half dat on-site consultation provided by principal of Hillers School.

Verona

One all day consultation provided by a member of the LEM staff.

One evening meeting with parents conducted by two members of the LEM staff.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS REPLICATED

The following information is based upon the response of consumer districts to an evaluation questionnaire on the replication of Project IEM. Training occurred in summer, 1973 and responses were submitted during the 1973-74 academic year.

DISTRICT — PROGRAM ELEMENT IMPLEMENTED

	Teachers	Administrators	Students	Teacher Teams	Differentiated staffing	Citizens Advisory Council	Multi-aged groupings	Facilities Modification	Non-graded instructional approach	Basic skills groupings by level	LEM scheduling pattern	Team approach to instruction	Projected Plans
Freehold: Intermediate School	10	1	250 gr. 5-6	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	Expand Modify
Jersey City: Open Classroom Pilot Project	NO IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM												
Maplewood/South Orange: Marshall School	6	1	135 gr. 5-6	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	Expand
Oakland: Manito School	22	1	555 gr. 2-5				X		X	X			Expand
Verona: F.N. Brown School	7	1	160	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	Continue, Modify

TOTALS:

4 adopter districts

45 teachers using three or more program elements

1,100 students involved in instructional programs of three or more LEM elements.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $12,279

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Project LEM: Home-School Interaction 4,000 printed

Reprints of

Overview and Evaluation 10,000 reprints

Environment and Space Utilization 6,000

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 530

Approximately 16 introductory presentations to approximately 1,000 persons.

PRESENTATIONS

September 27, 1973	Office of Equal Opportunity, Glassboro State College, Glassboro, New Jersey - Mrs. E. Russo.
October 3, 1973	North Hanover Township School District, North Hanover, New Jersey - Mr. J. D'Ambrosio, Mrs. K. Sweeney.
October 9, 1973	Office of Equal Opportunity, Educational Improvement Center, Cedar Knolls, New Jersey - Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mr. F. Wilson, Mrs. A. Small.
October 16, 1973	Curriculum Alternatives Workshop, Tempe, Arizona - Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mrs. E. Russo.
October 23, 1973	Hillers Schools P. T. A., Hackensack, New Jersey - Mrs. E. Russo.
November 2, 1973	Educational Improvement Center, Cedar Knolls, New Jersey - Mrs. J. Kenefick, Mrs. A. DeLuca.
November 15, 1973	New Jersey Education Association Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey - Mr. B. Kaminsky, Mrs. C. Colella.
November 29, 1973	Bergen County Educational Association, Ridgewood, New Jersey - Mrs. C. Colella, Miss Marylou Keyes.
December 10, 1973	Milford Public Schools, Frenchtown, New Jersey - Mrs. J. Kenefick.
February 4, 1974	Roosevelt School P. T. A., Ridgefield Park, New Jersey - Mrs. J. Kenefick, Mr. L. Kessler.

March 19, 1974	Westbrook J. H. S. Parent Group, Paramus, New Jersey - Mrs. K. Sweeney, Team Leader, Mrs. Sharon Ratner, parent and Lisa Ratner, pupil.
April 30, 1974	National Association of Elementary School Principals, Anaheim, California - Mrs. E. Russo.
May 1, 1974	White Plains Public Schools, White Plains, New York - Mrs. J. Kenefick.
May 4, 1974	Good Ideas Conference, Monmouth College, Monmouth, New Jersey - Mrs. J. Kenefick.
May 10, 1974	East Hanover Regional Schools, East Hanover, New Jersey - Mrs. A. Small, Mr. M. Burke.
June 7, 1974	Semple Elementary School staff and administrators, Louisville, Kentucky - Mrs. E. Russo

Articles describing the project

An article entitled "Involvement is the Aim of Open Classroom" appeared in the New York Times, March 17, 1974 issue. Articles also appeared in the N.J.E.A. Review and the National Advisory Committee Reports on Federal Projects.

Radio program describing the project

A radio show entitled "Speaking of Schools" sponsored by N.J.E.A. featured Joyce Kenefick, Team Leader, taped at the Good Ideas Conference Presentation, speaking about the LEM Project on May 27 at 4:45 p.m., WQXR - Newark and WPRZ - Paterson.

Written inquiries about project

20 from New Jersey

30 from other states

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential Elements of the Program:

Teacher teams
Differentiated staffing pattern
Citizens Advisory Council
Multi-aged groupings
Facilities modification
Non-graded instructional approach
Basic skills groupings by levels
LEM scheduling pattern
Team approach to implementing units of instruction

Training for District Staff:

Training in the above project components occurred in five consecutive half-day periods during the summer, 1974 at Hillers Elementary School, Hackensack, which is the original LEM site. Training is conducted by the LEM teaching staff, the principal of Hillers School, and the project director.

Followup Consultation:

Two to three followup consultations by a member of the LEM staff are recommended for the school year following the training.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT

Twenty-one teachers and 4 administrators from 4 districts were trained. Four districts submitted evaluations of the training. See summary on following pages.

Districts whose staffs received training in LEM

Closter	St. Mary's School	3	teachers gr. 1-3, 7	1	administrator (principal)
Maplewood-South Orange	Marshall School	5	teachers gr. 4-6	1	administrator (principal)
Monroe Twp.	White Hall School	6	teachers gr. 4	1	administrator
Teaneck	Longfellow School	7	teachers	2	administrators (principal & assistant principal)
TOTALS					
4 districts	3 public schools 1 nonpublic school	21	teachers	4	administrators

LEM WORKSHOP EVALUATION

	Successful	Sufficient	Lacking
Philosophy and goals of open education.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	2	0
Williamstown	5	0	0
Teaneck	7	0	0
St. Mary's	2	1	0
Your Project's objectives.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	1	3	1
Williamstown	5	0	0
Teaneck	4	2	0
St. Mary's	2	1	0
Responsibilities of staff.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	1	4	0
Williamstown	4	0	0
Teaneck	5	2	0
St. Mary's	3	0	0
Formation of groups.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	1	4	0
Williamstown	2	2	0
Teaneck	3	4	0
St. Mary's	1	2	0
Scheduling of activities			
Maplewood/S. Orange	0	3	1
Williamstown	4	1	0
Teaneck	3	3	0
St. Mary's	3	0	0
Evaluation procedure			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	2	0
Williamstown	4	1	0
Teaneck	6	0	1
St. Mary's	3	0	0
Parent involvement.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	1	0
Williamstown	5	0	0
Teaneck	5	2	0
St. Mary's	2	1	0

LEM WORKSHOP EVALUATION (Cont'd)

	Successful	Sufficient	Lacking
Curriculum content			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	2	0
Williamstown	2	3	0
Teaneck	5	2	0
St. Mary's	2	1	0
Curriculum Content			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	2	0
Williamstown	2	3	0
Teaneck	2	5	0
St. Mary's	2	1	0
Individualized learning techniques			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	1	1
Williamstown	5	0	0
Teaneck	3	4	0
St. Mary's	1	2	0
Development of wholesome learning environment.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	3	2	0
Williamstown	4	1	0
Teaneck	7	1	0
St. Mary's	3	0	0
Team concerns.			
Maplewood/S. Orange	4	1	0
Williamstown	5	0	0
Teaneck	6	1	0
St. Mary's	3	0	0

Consultation Summary:

The following consultations were rendered by members of the LEM staff to districts whose staffs were trained in the summer, 1974. Consultation was provided during the 1974-75 school year.

Closter: St. Mary's School

One presentation to staff and parents by two members of the LEM staff and Program Disseminator.

Maplewood/South Orange: Marshall School

Several phone consultations between principal of Marshall School and principal of Hillers School.

Monroe Township: White Hall School

One all day consultation and half-day workshop conducted by two members of the LEM team.

Teaneck: Longfellow School

One day workshop for staff conducted by two members of the LEM team.

One presentation to parents by two LEM staff members.

The following information is based upon the response of consumer districts to an evaluation questionnaire on the replication of Project LEM. Training occurred in summer, 1974 and responses were submitted in the 1974-75 school year.

DISTRICT	Teachers	Administrators	Students	PROGRAM ELEMENTS IMPLEMENTED: Teacher Teams	Differentiated staffing	Citizens Advisory Council	Multi-aged groupings	Facilities Modification	Non-graded instructional approach	Basic skills groupings by level	LEM scheduling pattern	Team approach to instruction	Projected Plans
Closter: St. Mary's School	8	1	72 gr. K-8	X			X	X	X	X			Continue
Maplewood/South Orange Marshall School	5	1	120 gr. 4	X		X		X		X	X	X	Expand
Monroe Township: White Hall School				RESPONSE NOT YET SUBMITTED									
Teaneck: Longfellow School	4	2	100 gr. 5	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	Continue

TOTALS:

Two new adopter districts

One district expanding program from previous year

One district - no data yet

17 teachers using five or more program elements

292 students involved in instructional program of three or more LEM elements

1973-74 LEM

MOPPET: MEDIA ORIENTED PROGRAM PROMOTING
EXPLORATION IN TEACHING, Woodbridge, N.J.
Validated 1973

Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:	1972-73	$ 2,730
	1973-74	$20,153
	1974-75	$29,950
		$52,833

PROGRAM USE IN WOODBRIDGE AS OF SEPBEMBER, 1974:

22 schools, grades 1-6
348 teachers
8,602 students

The program at the elementary school level is fully funded by the Board of Education which supports 4 professional positions for the continued training of teachers and one non-professional, plus a budget for supplies.

STATEWI E DISSEMINATION IMPAC ":

1972-73 No formal training for outside teachers except visitations and presentations.

1973-74

	N.J.	Out of state
Teachers trained	100	3
Administrators trained	20	1
Adopter districts	22	3
Students in program	3,875	500
Teacher's Manuals sold	201	4
How to Do It manuals sold	88	4

1974-75 Projections for in-state impact

Teachers to be trained	115
Administrators to be trained	69
Adopter districts	14
Students to be included in the program	2,875
Teacher's Manuals to be sold	150
How to Do It manuals to be sold	100

PROJECTED CUMULATIVE FIGURES:
1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75

Adopter districts	39	Teachers trained	218
Administrators trained	89	Students in program (projected from sale of lessons)	6,750

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $8.00 per year.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	5,000	copies printed, winter 1972
MOPPET Teacher's Manual, K-6	400	copies to be sold at $10 each or $6 for K-3 and $6 for 4-6 (offered for sale late in June, 1973)
Overview brochure	5,000	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 200

Approximately 23 orientation presentations to approximately 1,350 persons:

N.J. School Board Association Convention, October, 1972, roundtable discussion.

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshop, October, 1972.

Language Arts Conference, Woodbridge, N.J., September 30, 1972.

Massachusetts State Department, Education Humanities Conference, October 4-6, 1972.

N.J.E.A., Atlantic City, November 3, 1972.

N.Y. Communications, Grossingers, N.Y., November 8, 1972.

Educational Improvement Center-South, Pitman, N.J., November 8, 1972.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, Cedar Knolls, N.J., November 9, 1972.

Dissemination, East Brunswick, N.J., November 2, 1972.

Regional Art Teachers, MOPPET, Woodbridge, N.J., December 13, 1972.

Art Teachers, Piscataway, N.J. two sessions, February 6 and 8, 1973.

All K-6 Teachers, Piscataway, N.J., February 13, 1973.

Symposium, South Orange, N.J., February 15, 1973.

Classroom Teachers, Pompton Lakes, three sessions; February 20 & 27, 1973 and March 6, 1973.

Good Ideas Conference, Monmouth, N.J., March 3, 1973.

International Reading Association, Monmouth, N.J., March 14, 1973.

Teachers Conference, Ocean Point School, Point Pleasant, N.J., March 17, 1973.

Humanities/English, Moorestown, N.J., March 31, 1973.

Educational Improvement Center-South, Pitman, N.J., April 16, 1973.

Classroom Teachers, Piscataway, N.J., May 23, 1973.

Articles describing the project

Newspaper articles	10
Articles in school system newsletters for teachers and parents	2
Project newsletter	1
Featured article in "Special B.I.T." New Jersey Education	1

Written inquiries about project

From New Jersey	167
From out of state	70

1973-74

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $20,153

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Introductory brochures	8,000	copies
MOPPET Teacher's Manual,		copies to be sold at $10 each or $6 for K-3 and $6 for 4-6
MOPPET, How to Do It	200	copies to be sold at $3 each

Materials Sold

Teacher's Manual	201	copies, total receipts $1,790
MOPPET, How to Do It	88	copies, total receipts $264

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project	250

Approximately 12 introductory presentations to approximately 1,200 persons:

Art Educators of New Jersey, Demonstration - "MOPPET Art Process", "Overview of MOPPET", G. Alibani & A. Kohler, October 12, 1973.

N.J.E.A., Atlantic City, N.J., - "Overview of MOPPET", "Use of Media in MOPPET", A. Kohler. Booth staffed by R. Mazzeo, November 14-16, 1973.

MOPPET presentation, Hackensack, N.J. - Intorduction t· MOPPET, G. Alibani, November 26, 1973.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, Cedar Knolls, N.J., Introduction to MOPPET, Drama Demonstration, Components of MOPPET, Art Demonstration, A. Kohler, A. Battle, R. Mazzeo, G. Alibani, December 7, 1973.

Rider College, Trenton, N.J., Introduction to MOPPET - R. Mazzeo; Filmmaking Demonstration - S. Evans, December 7, 1973.

Drama Demonstration, Channel 52, Trenton, N.J. - A. Battle, March 6, 1974.

Teacher Workshops, Spotswood, N.J., Introduction to MOPPET - A. Kohler; Filmmaking Demonstration - S. Evans, March 13, 1974. Art Demonstration - G. Alibani, March 20, 1974. Movement/Drama Demonstration - A. Battle and C. Henry, March 27, 1974.

Montclair State College, Montclair, N.J., Introduction to MOPPET - R. Mazzeo, March 28, 1974.

N.J.E.A. Good Ideas Conference, Monmouth College, Art Demonstration - G. Alibani; MOPPET - A. Kohler; Filmmaking Demonstration - S. Evans; Movement Demonstration - C. Henry; Poetry Demonstration - B. Distler, April 27, 1974.

Professional Enrichment Conference, Trenton State College, MOPPET Process - A. Kohler, May 1, 1974.

Articles about project

Newspaper article	1

(The very heavy publicity in 1972-73 was arousing local antagonism, consequently we decided not to press local publicity in 1973-74 and depend basically on Title III dissemination throughout state and our own mailings of materials.)

Written inquiries about project

From New Jersey	69
From out of state	82

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential elements of the program:

Use of MOPPET lessons at least twice per month in any of the categories: Art, drama, poetry, movement, filmmaking, music.

Training and consultation services offered:

The following series of training programs was offered at the MOPPET site:

January 9	Introduction to MOPPET
January 16	Initiating MOPPET
January 25	Art
January 30	Drama
February 6	Poetry
February 13	Movement
February 20	Filmmaking
February 27	Music
March 6	Kits and Services
March 13	Evaluation

- How to initiate a MOPPET type program.
- How to utilize the process developed in each discipline.
- How to create aural and visual environments.
- How to utilize staff.
- How to develop kits and resource materials for the teachers.
- How to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

Additional training in any of the above areas and/or followup consultation is available to districts that use the program. The MOPPET staff recommends one or two followup consultations to districts whose staffs have been trained by the MOPPET staff.

Summary of training and followup consultation offered:

Average attendance at the ten workshops offered at the MOPPET site was 20. Persons attending included representatives of the following 22 New Jersey districts: (not all attended every session)

Annandale
Bayonne
Caldwell, West Caldwell
Clinton Township
Cranbury
Downe Township
East Brunswick
Glen Ridge
Hackensack
Hackettstown
Keasby Vocational School (Woodbridge)
Millburn
Montclair
Passaic
Piscataway
Plainfield
Rider College
Ridgewood
Rockaway Township
Roselle
Rutgers University
South Plainfield
Trenton State College
Wayne

Followup consultations and/or training in consumer districts were rendered to the following districts:

11/28/73	Teacher Workshop Hackensack, N.J.	Drama	A. Battle
		Art	G. Alibani
4/18/74	Workshop, Millburn, N.J.	Intro. to MOPPET	R. Mazzeo
5/2/74		Conceptual Model	A. Kohler
5/16/74		Dramo Demonstration	A. Battle
5/16/74			R. Mazzeo
4/23/74	Teacher Workshop Montclair, N.J.	Drama Demonstration	A. Battle
5/7/74		Movement Demonstration	C. Henry
5/9/74		Conceptual Model	A. Kohler
5/14/74		Filmmaking Demo.	S. Evans
5/21/74		Poetry Demonstration	B. Distler
5/23/74		Lesson Process	R. Mazzeo
5/28/74		Music Demonstration	K. Young
6/4/74		Art Demonstration	G. Alibani
6/6/74		Lesson Development	R. Mazzeo

In response to a questionnaire distributed in May, 1974 districts whose staffs had been trained in the MOPPET program and/or purchased MOPPET materials described their implementation of MOPPET as summarized below:

	District	Contact Person	No. of Schools	Grades
1.	Bernardsville	James Mangiafico, Vice Principal, Bernardsville Elementary School	1	1-3
2.	Carteret	Donna Lee Barnes, Pre-school Teacher, N.J. ARC Raritan Valley Unit	1	Preschool
3.	Clinton Twp.	Starr Foster, Teacher, Spruce Run School	1	K-1
4.	Englewood	V.F. Cantwell, Principal Roosevelt School	1	K-5
5.	Fairlawn	Floyd Smith, Principal Edison School	1	3-6
6.	Freehold	Irene Mauch, Reading Dir., Roberta Mitchell, Librarian Intermediate School	1	5-6
7.	Frenchtown	Edward Dragan, Director Anselmo Comm. School	1	K-2 group 3-6 group

	District	Contact Person	No. of Schools	Grades
8.	Hackettstown	R. Irsay, Team Leader Willow Grove School	1	4
9.	Maple Shade	Daniel Mastrobuoni, Asst. Supt., Maple Shade	2	1-3
10.	Millburn	Dolores Radtke Director of Curriculum	7	K-3 Spec. Subj. Areas
11.	Pittman	Jane McMonagle, Principal Special Education	1	K-1 Spec. Ed.
12.	Pompton Lakes	Dr. H. Weintraub Curriculum Director	2	?
13.	Rockaway Twp.	Mrs. Lila Wainer Art Coordinator	6	All (Art)
14.	Skillman	Kathie Bush, Teacher Burnt Hill Road School	1	3
15.	Somers Point	Edwin Eckerson Curriculum Coordinator	3	1-6
16.	Somerset	J. Todd, Librarian Elizabeth Ave. School	1	K-3
17.	South Plainfield	Joanne Rogo, Voc. Music Jayne Geiger, Teach John E. Riley School	1 1	1-3 K-6
18.	Spotswood	Carol Funk, Psychologist Pamela Hemstreet, Guid. Couns. Memorial School	1	5-6
		Bill Dunnigan, Principal Appleby School	1	K-1
19.	Wayne	Thelma Molk, Reading Spec. Randall Carter School	1	K-5
20.	Weehawken	Robert Russell, Music Teacher, Webster School	2	1-6 (Music)
21.	Westfield	J.M. McDermott Music (K-6)	1	5
22.	Wharton	R. Episcopo, Unit Leader M.V. Duffy School	1	4-5
		TOTAL IMPLEMENTATIONS:	40 Schools 22 Districts	

	Out of State Districts	Contact Person	No. of Schools	Grades
1.	No. Attleboro, Massachusetts	A.D. Battista, Principal Landy Avenue School	1	K-5
2.	Wellesley, Mass.	Leonard J. Anderson, Art Director, Wellesley Public Schools	1	K-6 (Art)
3.	Quincy, Mass.	Richard Ramsdell, Asst. Director, Arts/Humanities Quincy Public Schools Wrote ESEA Title III Proposal Section 306	1 Demo. school	K-6
4.	Lewisburg, Pa.	John E. Litz, Asst. Exec. Director, Central Susquehanna Inter. Unit	Resource	

Instructors from four colleges answered the survey:

1. California, Penna., State College
2. Trenton State College
3. Felician College
4. College of St. Elizabeth

Mrs. Helena Berger, Instructor, Trenton State College used materials with early childhood student teachers, visited the demonstration site, indicated she would like to continue involvement.

Sister Francis Rafferty, Chairman of Department of Education, College of St. Elizabeth used materials with student teachers, visited the demonstration site, indicated she would like to continue involvement.

Responses to selected sections of the questionnaire are semmarized below:

1. In which dissemination activities of Project MOPPET have you been involved?

Received printed materials at no cost	29
Viewed the filmstrip/tape overview	10
Viewed videotapes	1
Visited the demonstration site	29
Purchased MOPPET Teacher's Manual (s)	29
Purchased MOPPET How To Do It	15
Attended one or more of the ten in-service workshops, January - March, 1974	18
Signed a producer-consumer agreement involving three workshops/demonstration/consultations in your district	3
Write an ESEA Title III consumer proposal	3
N.J.E.A. Conference	1

2. Which of the components of the MOPPET program will it be possible to put into operation in your school or district?

(Check areas of focus)

Art	20	Movement	14
Filmmaking	12	Poetry	17
Drama		Music	15
MOPPET lessons	24	Not specified	2
MOPPET room	3	Incorporated already	1
Kits of materials	9	Not ready	1
MOPPET screen	7		

3. Who are the people who will be involved in the implementation?

Superintendent	4	Special area teachers	22
Asst. Superintendent	1	Media specialists	12
Directors	3	Librarians	12
Supervisors	4	School Psych. & Counselor	1
Coordinators	5	Child Study teams	1
Principals	13	Not specified	6
Classroom teachers	24		

4. How were MOPPET dissemination materials used in your district?

Board of Education Meetings	1	In-service meetings	1
Staff Meetings	18	Librarians	1
Citizens Advisory Groups		Special Svcs. Dept.	1
Parent Teachers Meetings		Faculty Board Com. Student Curriculum Commission	1
Partial Staff	1	Used Lessons	1
Teacher-Librarian Planning	1	Other	1
Principals	1		

5. How do you plan to implement the MOPPET program?

Integrate into the curriculum with classroom teachers teaching MOPPET lessons.	13
Integrate into the special subject areas (music, physical education, art) with specialists teaching MOPPET lessons.	17
Utilize librarians to interrelate MOPPET lessons with librarian activities.	9
Use a combination of the above	12
None of the above.	3
Not specified.	3

6. At what level do you expect to implement the MOPPET program?

Preschool	1	Grade 4	13
Kindergarten	10	Grade 5	16
Grade 1	16	Grade 6	11
Grade 2	13	Grade 7-8	1
Grade 3	13	Not specified	10

SUMMARY:

In New Jersey, 1974-75, the use of MOPPET lessons as part of a regular classroom curriculum includes approximately 1,975 students (beyond those in the originating district). The lessons' use as part of special subjects curricula (i.e., art, music, etc.) includes approximately 1,900 students (beyond those in the originating district).

In states other than New Jersey, the lessons are used in regular classrooms of approximately 325 students and in special subjects curricula with approximately 175 students.

N.J. Districts using MOPPET lessons	22	N.J. schools involved	40
Districts in other states using MOPPET lessons	3	Schools in other states involved	3
N.J. students invluded in program	3,875	Students in other states included in program	500
Number of Teacher's Manuals sold	201		
Number of How to Do It sold	88		

NOTE ON TEACHER TRAINING FROM PROJECT DIRECTOR:

As a practical matter the MOPPET staff has found that teachers display a very great variation in their abilities, interests and quality of training. Thus, we have found that a minority of teachers have sufficient background and understanding to do MOPPET lessons effectively with no aid other than the MOPPET teaching manuals. Therefore, it is potentially possible, considering the vast numbers of teachers in the country, to get a great many adoptions from teachers of this general class.

On the other hand, if a given principal, for example, wished to adopt MOPPET in his school, it is almost certain that the majority of his teachers would fall into the average class. In this case, special training is really essential if they are to do the lessons effectively.

PROJECT: OPEN CLASSROOM, Wayne, New Jersey
Validated 1973

Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1973-74

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:	1973-74	$59,287
	1974-75	$86,117
		$145,404

PROGRAM USE IN WAYNE AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

1	school
500	students
20	teachers

The program is fully supported by Wayne Board of Education funds.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

1973-74	Districts entering program	3 *
	Teachers trained	45
	Administrators trained	6
	Students in program	900

* Two districts have continued the program beyond the first year.

1974-75	New districts entering program	3
	New teachers to be trained	25
	Administrators to be trained	4
	Parent aides to be trained	25
	Students to be in program	500

PROJECTED CUMULATIVE IMPACT:
1973-74, 1974-75

Adopter districts	6	Teachers trained	70
Administrators trained	10	Others trained	25
		Students in program	1,200

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $59,287

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	6,000	copies
Language Arts Kit	1,000	copies
Math Resource Kits		
Primary Level	1,000	copies
Intermediate Level	1,000	copies

Materials sold at cost

Item	Cost	Amt. Received
Language Arts Kit	$25.00	$2,550.00
Math Resource File Primary	6.00	654.00
Math Resource File Intermediate	6.00	600.00

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 236

Approximately 20 introductory presentations:

Introduction to Project Open Classroom - showed film (BBC) on Changeover to 75 people from Lincoln and Lenox School, Pompton Lakes, N.J., September 4, 1973 - (workshop leader - T. Newman). 3:30 - 5:35 p.m.

Open Classroom orientation at Haskell School, Wanaque, N.J. for teachers from Wanaque, Pompton Plains, Ringwood etc., approximately 125 people, September 25, 1973 - (workshop leaders - T. Newman, H. Melnick, J. Meyer). 3:30 - 4:30 p.m.

State dissemination awareness workshop, Glassboro College, September 26 & 27, 1973 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). all day

Awareness workshop - 100 teachers from West Milford Twp., Westbrook School, October 8, 1973 - (workshop leaders, T. Newman, H. Melnick). 9:30-1:30 p.m.

Continuation of September 27 workshop - 52 people attended, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, Cedar Knolls, N.J., October 9, 1973 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). 8:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop on classroom environment. Bank St. Filmstrip "A Teacher Talks", first of a 3-day workshop, Educational Improvement Center, October 11, 1973 - (workshop leaders, T. Newman, H. Melnick, P. Liloia). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Reading and language arts in the open classroom, Chatham, Educational Improvement Center, October 17, 1973 - (workshop leaders, T. Newman, T. Schweitzer). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Task card writing - the use of the flow chart - 100 people, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, October 25, 1973 - (workshop leaders, T. Newman, H. Melnick, P. Liloia). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop introducing Project: Open Classroom to the School Development Council (70 administrators, Board of Education members), Rutgers University, October 31, 1973 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). 9:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop for Scotch Plains P.T.A. (60 people attended), November 7, 1973 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). 8:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop at N.J.E.A. Convention, Atlantic City, November 15, 1973 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Awareness workshop for the Brooklyn Catholic Diocese (35 people), Brooklyn, N.Y., February 25, 1974 - (workshop leaders, T. Newman, J. Little). all day

Awareness workshop at Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, covering philosophy of open classroom room environment, flow chart & task card writing, March 5, 1974 - (workshop leaders, P. Liloia, T. Newman, H. Melnick). 9:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop for prospective open classroom teachers for next year, Butler, N.J., March 6, 1974 - (workshop leaders, P. Liloia, H. Melnick, T. Newman) 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Awareness workshop - first of three sessions for 80 people, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, March 14, 1974 - (workshop leaders, P. Liloia, T. Newman, H. Melnick). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Math Workshop - Cuisenaire Rods and Math Lab, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, March 21, 1974 - (workshop leaders, P. Liloia, H. Melnick). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Last of 3 sessions (approximately 80 people) on task card and flow chart, Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, March 28, 1974 -(workshop leaders, T. Newman, H. Melnick, P. Liloia). 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

Introductory presentation for administrators, teachers and parents on open classroom in Wayne, Bayside, N.Y., P.S. 203Q, April 24, 1974 - (workshop leaders, B. Paul, B. Franco). 7:30 - 9:30

Introduction to open classroom - Livingston League of Women Voters, Livingston, April 25, 1974 - (workshop leader, T. Newman). 8:00 p.m.

Awareness level workshop for 5 teachers for possible private school commitment for next year, Frenchtown, Anselmo School, May 31, 1974 - (workshop leader, P. Liloia). 11:00 - 2:00 p.m.

Written inquiries about project

From New Jersey	89
From out of state	112

TRAINING AND FOLLOWUP CONSULTATION OFFERED

Essential elements of the program:

Listed below is the program description outlining the essential elements of Project: Open Classroom.

Attitudes:

Recognition and accommodation of individual differences of children, personalities, rates and styles of learning, social development.

Planning together by students and teachers with exercise of responsible choice on part of children.

Humanizing relationships with stress on positive, constructive, open-minded values.

Physical Atmosphere:

Organization of learning centers in the classroom, which center around specific subjects, tasks or resource materials, and function as "interest centers" for children.

Flexible scheduling.

Frequent regrouping of students to meet individual needs.

Wide range of media, resources and supplies available for children to choose and to use.

Productive atmosphere, organized and non-conforming, where children are expected to learn, to be responsible, to choose where, when, how long, and (some of) what is to be learned.

Curriculum:

Use of individual pupil profiles as a way to chart, by skills and concepts, pupil progress.

Use of individualized materials, whether teacher made or commercially available, in individualized prescriptions for students.

Use of task cards for various subjects which provide task-specific activities.

Use of manipulative materials leading to concrete experiences in mathematics.

Training:

Individual, small group, and full faculty conferences, in and out of the classroom, are alternately utilized in response to teacher needs and progress they are making.

Often alteration of basic educational philosophy is an integral feature of teacher training. It is difficult to achieve due to the personal nature of erroneous, deep-rooted convictions relating to how children learn. Therefore, the amount of time normally required for replication of the individual elements or the entire project cannot be accurately projected. The slowest replicators can take four years, while others are achieving our goals after 1-1/2 years.

Training Summary:

District	Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Administrators	Training and Consultation
Pompton Lakes	Lenox School	9	1	25 sessions 104 hours
	Lincoln School	11	1	
Maplewood - South Orange	Newstead School	5 3 spec.	1	23 sessions 114 hours
	First Street School	6	1	
Millburn	Washington School	9	2	11 sessions 52 hours

Consultation provided to principals:

Four half-day seminars were held for the principals of the three consumer districts in 1974. Their purpose was to introduce principals to observation and leadership techniques keyed to open classroom goals, changeover practices, understanding the place of concrete and abstract learning experiences based on the studies of Piaget, and reorganizing learning as a problem-solving and interrelated experience.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS REPLICATED

These data are based upon letters from representatives of the consumer districts, dated, February, 1975.

Pompton Lakes (two schools)

Number of teachers, students, administrators involved:

teachers:	Lenox School	9	Lincoln School	11
students:	Lenox School	275	Lincoln School	225
administrators:	Principals	2	Curriculum director	1

Essential Elements of Project Open Classroom that were replicated:
(percentage indicates the amount of classrooms that replicated the element)

task cards	100%	flexible scheduling	50%
learning centers	100%	use of check-lists in math and reading	20%
contracts	10%	use of regular and emergency classroom meeting	30%
use of manipulative materials	100%		
use of classroom aides	40%		

Degree of Success in Replication of Open Classroom:

Satisfactory. Some teachers have made extraordinary progress, while others show little or no gains. The entire atmosphere of both schools has dramatically changed since implementation of the program. Few teachers in either school (including teachers who are uncommitted to the program) have maintained their previous programs.

Now it would be difficult to find classrooms with desks and chairs in rows. Subject specialization and use of the Joplin Plan for reading have ceased. Materials and methods for individualization of instruction are in widespread use. Criterion referenced testing is being studied by all teachers and will probably come into universal use in the next year. Record keeping of individuals by use of Project Open Classroom's Checklist objectives is already standard procedure by most teachers. Use of task cards, manipulative materials and learning centers is also a characteristic of most classrooms.

South Orange - Maplewood (Newstead School)

Number of teachers, students, administrators involved:

administrators	1	specialists	4
teachers	8	students	125

The program will be expanded in 1974-75.

Essential Elements Replicated:

After two years of involvement the primary unit is in the process of developing all elements of open classroom.

a. integrated day
b. interest centers
c. individualized instruction
d. individualized record keeping
e. checklist of skills
f. humanistic environment
g. multi-aged, hetergeneous grouping
h. task cards
i. written language experiences
j. free time choices

Students were more independent and responsive to the interaction and activities after having been involved in the program for only a short time. They have gained many advantages from expanded exposure to the use of manipulatives and learning activities, which are individualized and success oriented. Since the program, the children expressed an added interest in school - "a fun school".

Millburn (Washington School)

Number of teachers, students, administrators involved:

teachers	9	students	128	(K-6)
administrators	1 principal	students	12	(N.I.)

What degree of success have you experienced in the replication of specific elements of open classroom?

Considerable.

The representative of the consumer district, an assistant superintendent, said that the program would continue. The program's initiator in the consumer district no longer works there. The project director states that the program is not being continued.

POLLUTION CONTROL EDUCATION CENTER, Union, New Jersey
(Validated 1973)

PROGRAM IN USE IN UNION AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

6 schools
1,200 students

The program is fully integrated into the elementary school curriculum.

In May, 1972 the Union Township Board of Education signed a contract with McGraw-Hill/Webster Division for the distribution of 3 kits, delivered photo-ready. An option was taken on the subsequent 3 kits being field tested. According to the terms of this contract 2% of the royalties are invested by McGraw-Hill into the provision of consultation services to potential consumers; 4% of the royalties are returned to the Union Township Board of Education as grant related income which will be invested into continued curriculum development by the Pollution Control Education Center. The option on the second set of kits was exercised.

Representatives of this project have engaged in a limited number of orientation presentations to introduce these materials to educators. The OPD staff estimates that approximately $1,500, primarily in staff time, has been devoted to this effort.

Control Education Center

UNION TOWNSHIP PUBLIC SCHOOLS

December 17, 1974

TO: Dorothy Soper
Office of Program Development

FROM: Charles F. Murphy, Director
Pollution Control Education Center

SUBJECT: Priority One: Environment Sales Figures

The total sales of the Priority One: Environment program through June 30, 1974 are:

Total sales as of June 30, 1974	$35,643.50
Royalties of 6%	2,138.61
McGraw-Hill consumer training support	712.87
Cash royalties paid to the Union Township Board of Education	1,425.74

cc: Dr. J. Caulfield
Patricia McCutcheon

MORRIS AVENUE • UNION, NEW JERSEY • 07083 (201) 688-1200

Webster Division

McGraw-Hill Book Company

1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

November 9, 1972

Dr. Evelyn Ogden
Office of Program Development
1000 Spruce Street
Trenton, NJ

Dear Dr. Ogden:

Charles Murphy of the Union, NJ schools has asked me to let you know our McGraw-Hill estimate of the market for PRIORITY I - ENVIORNMENT. As you know, we plan to market this program starting in April of 1973. We will display the materials first at the NSTA national meeting in Detroit. Subsequently, we will be exhibiting throughout the nation at all key meetings such as ASCD, Elementary Principals, and others. We also plan to conduct regional workshops throughout the nation.

We hope that we can put kits into use in a minimum of 3,000 classrooms. This would represent a penetration of approximately 3% of elementary classrooms in the nation at grades 4, 5, and 6.

Very truly yours,

Fred Boyd
Product Manager

FB:ll

cc: Charles Murphy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP, New Providence, New Jersey
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74

Validated, 1973

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:		
	1972-73	$12,536
	1973-74	5,111
	1974-75	9,885
		$27,532

PROGRAM USE IN NEW PROVIDENCE AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

3 schools, grades 1-6
3 teachers
45 students

The program is fully funded by the New Providence Board of Education.

STATEWIDE DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

1972-73	Teachers and administrators trained	24
	Districts adopting some of the program's essential elements	7
1973-74	Teachers and administrators trained	32
	Districts using some of the program's essential elements	11
1974-75	Projections:	
	Teachers and administrators trained	26
	Districts adopting program's essential elements	2

TOTALS FOR DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

	1972-73, 1973-74	projected cumulative figures 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75
Adopter districts (for 1 or more program elements)	18	20
Students in program	270	300
Teachers and administrators trained	56	82

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $91.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $12,536

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	5,000	copies (printed, spring 1972)
Resource Manual	500	copies
Overview filmstrip/tape	25	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 50

Representatives of 21 districts.
Members of 7 Child Study Teams.
Three faculty members of New Jersey colleges.

Approximately 250 persons attended orientation presentations:

N.J. School Board Assoc. Convention, October, 1972, roundatle discussion.

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshop, October, 1972.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, November, 1972.

Fairleigh Dickinson-Doctoral faculty and students, Rutherford, N.J., October, 1972.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, Cedar Knolls, N.J., November, 1972.

Approximately 200 copies of the Resource Manual were distributed by mail or in person to interested parties.

TRAINING PROVIDED

The essential elements of the program in which training is provided are:

1. Use of the organizational structure of assigning learning disabled students to learning activities in a special class as well as a regular class.

2. Ongoing evaluation of student progress and adjustment of student schedules as required.

Project staff offered the following one-day training program in the essential elements:

1. Preparatory message from superintendent.

2. Brief overview of how and why program was conceived and subsequently developed. Include procedures for screening and parental orientation evaluation.

3. Distribute packet of materials to include technical brief and resource manual.

4. Video-tape presentation of workshops in operation.

5. Question and discussion period.

6. Presentation of a complete case history of a "typical" workshop student by project disseminator.

7. Implementation of educational prescription. Description of this process by workshop teacher and classroom teacher. Mechanics of scheduling to be included in this discussion.

8. Demonstration of specialized instructional equipment and materials by workshop teacher.

9. Presentation by a consultant in a specific area related to prescriptive teaching and/or diagnosis of learning disabilities.

10. Resume of day's discussion using such techniques as a panel discussion or small group discussions.

11. Participants submit evaluation of program to disseminator and are given instructions on how they might apply for summer workshop.

Summary of Training Impact:

Two one-day training programs were held. Eight district Child Study Teams for a total of 24 persons attended these programs.

Feedback via questionnaire, letter, phone, or direct verbal communication indicated that seven school districts who had visited a project orientation or training program have either adopted or adapted some of the principals and procedures of the project.

Four-day training program was held in the summer, 1973 as per the following outline:

SUMMER PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title III - Dissemination Activities
July 9 through 26, 1973

Purposes and Objectives:

1. To provide four training workshops for approximately twenty-five participants in techniques of educational assessment and prescriptive teaching to include the following topics:

   a. Behavior modification techniques as part of an educational prescription.

   b. Techniques of educational assessment.

115

c. Individualized instruction through computer technology.

d. Diagnostic teaching and prescriptive writing techniques. Participants would include resource room teachers, learning disabilities specialists, and special education administrators.

2. To summarize such discussions and prepare a written guide for distribution to resource room teachers entitled "Guidelines for Writing Educational Prescriptions". This would serve as an addendum to the Resource Manual already published.

Time Line:

1. Workshops: For such workshops, each four hours in duration, to be held at Salt Brook School in New Providence, July 9-12, 1973.

2. Writing Team: During the period of July 16-27, a team of four teachers will finalize a written addendum to the Resource Manual entitled, "Guidelines forEducational Prescription Writing". These guidelines are to be subsequently printed and distributed to selected districts and agencies.

Approximately 25 persons attended from New Providence and 8 other school districts. Four New Providence teachers wrote a summary of the information provided in the workshop, Addendum, 1973, to the Resource Manual.

1973-74
PTW

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $5,111

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED OR REPRINTED

Technical Brief (revised)	5,000	copies
Resource Manual (reprinted)	500	copies
Addendum to Resource Manual	250	copies

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 40

Representatives of three Child Study Teams.
Representatives of fifteen districts.
Faculty members of four colleges.

116

Approximately 300 persons attended orientation presentations:

Union County Association of School Psychologists, January, 1974.

Special Service personnel from five districts, March, 1974 at New Providence, March, 1974.

Council for Exceptional Children annual convention, New York, April, 1974.

N.J.E.A. Good Ideas Conference, April, 1974.

Rotary Club, Summit, April, 1974.

Summit Junior League - Provisional Member-Community Orientation, May, 1974.

American Psychological Association, Caribbean Institute, Puerto Rico.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, October, 1973, two-hour presentation cosponsored by EIC-NW and Office of Program Development.

N.J.E.A. Convention, November, 1974, one-hour presentation.

Approximately 250 Resource Manuals and Addenda were distributed by mail or in person.

TRAINING PROVIDED

The essential elements of the program in which training is provided are:

1. Use of the organizational structure of assigning learning disabled students to learning activities in a special class as well as a regular class.

2. Ongoing evaluation of student progress and adjustment of student schedules as required.

Project staff offered a one-day training program in the essential elements. The outline of the program is given in the dissemination report summary for 1972-73.

Summary of Training and Consultation Impact:

Two one-day training programs were held. Representatives of eight school districts for a total of 32 persons attended these programs.

Questionnaires with stamped, self-addressed return envelopes were sent to the 37 individuals who attended either a one-half day or a full day on-site visit. These 37 people represented 21 different school districts.

Sixteen questionnaires were returned (43%) from 11 different school systems (52%), 14 contained names and 2 annonymous. The 5 people from Union City, who had attended a full-day training session, all completed and returned the questionnaire to the disseminating district. Only 1 person from each of the other 10 school systems returned a questionnaire.

Of the 11 districts under consideration who had attended a PTW presentation, 5 did not establish a resource room for the '74-'75 school year, mainly because their administrations and/or Boards of Education 'rejected' such a proposal. In summary, this group related that they found the on-site visit "enjoyable" and "helpful" but not effective in setting up a similar workshop for handicapped children in their respective school systems.

Eight school districts requested additional on-site visits to New Providence to "learn about the program", "gain insights", "see how such a program can function in coordination with regular class situations", "compare with own program", "observe a successful model", and "gain first-hand information on how they are conducted and equipped" for the purpose of gaining further knowledge on how to develop the PTW concept in their own school districts.

On question #5 of the questionnaire, "Has the New Providence school district influenced the development or adoption of a resource room in any way?", all 11 of the responses were "yes", stating further "we hope to establish such a program in September 1974", "the schedules seem quite effective", "it provided a model and general information", "background material for discussion", "the site visitation helped in evaluating our year old program", "your success proved helpful in presenting the concept to administrators", and "the mere fact that a resource room can function within a regular school".

Six school districts indicated that further services in the form of some type of training program would be useful. Types of additional services requested included classification of children, developing comprehensive prescriptions to help each child, discussing appropriate numbers of children to be placed in a resource room, developing a middle school resource room, sharing of experiences and establishing staff confidence and approval of the program (in-service). Such services were requested for Fall, 1974 and Spring, 1975 for teachers (resource room and classroom), members of the Child Study Team, administrators (as principals, coordinators and directors) and teacher aides.

Districts whose staff responded to the questionnaire are:

Bernardsville	Hopatcong	Roselle
Bridgewater-Raritan	Leonia	Plainfield
Butler	Manville	Watchung
Harding Township	Plainfield	Verona
	Rahway	

The districts reported that they had 1) adopted the concept of mainstreaming elementary children classified for special education who had previously been in special education classes only, 2) adapted the PTW model of prescriptive programs for children, and 3) utilized a cooperative teachers-principal team to plan and carry out the program following the PTW model.

COMMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT:

It should be noted that in 1973-74 there were several dissemination sites for the mainstreaming concept in special education. Several consultants from the Department of Education, Division of Curriculum and Instruction and both EIC-South and Northwest as well as the ESEA, Title III demonstration site, Learning Center in Winslow, were the primary ones available to New Jersey educators.

PROJECT SEE: SPECIFIC EDUCATION OF THE EYE, Union, New Jersey
Summary of dissemination impact and cost, 1972-73, 1973-74
(Validated, 1973)

DISSEMINATION BUDGETS:		
	1972-73	$12,370
	1973-74	44,214
	1974-75	25,798
		$82,382

PROGRAM IN USE IN UNION AS OF SEPTEMBER, 1974:

6	public schools
2	nonpublic schools
37	teachers
675	students, public schools
200	students, nonpublic schools

The use of the program in public and nonpublic schools is completely supported by local funding.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:		N.J.	Other States
1972-73	Level I Kit distributed	117	11
	Districts represented	40	11
	Projected number of students in program	2,925	275
1973-74	Level I Kits distributed	119	14
	Level II Kits distributed	58	7
	Tactuals	4	0
	Districts represented	68	12
	Projected number of students in program	4,425	525
1974-75	Projections		
	Level I Kits	100	350
	Level II Kits	50	100
	Tactuals	5	10
	Districts Represented	100	400
	Projected number of students in program	3,875	11,500

PROJECTED CUMULATIVE FIGURES:
1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75

TOTAL Level I Kits distributed	711	NJ students to be included	11,225
TOTAL Level II Kits distributed	215	NJ districts represented	208
TOTAL Tactuals distributed	19		
		Out of state students	12,300
TOTAL Projected Receipts	$16,600	Out of state districts	423

Over a three year period the approximate dissemination cost per student included in the program will be $3.50.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1972-73 BUDGET: $12,370

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Technical Brief	5,000 copies
Level I Instructional Kit	300 copies
Out of Sight Game	300 copies

Materials Sold

Item	Cost	Number sold	Amt. received
Level I Instruction Kit (Out of Sight Game included)	$15 for N.J. $25 for other states	90	$1,355

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 35-40

Approximately 10 orientation presentations to approximately 250 persons.

General Presentations

N.J. School Board Assoc. Convention, October, 1973, roundtable discussion.

Office of Program Development - N.J. School Administrators Association workshop, October, 1972.

Office of Program Development - Educational Improvement Center-South workshop, November, 1972.

Educational Improvement Center-South; two presentations, March, 1973.

Educational Improvement Center-Northwest, June, 1973.

Art Educators conference

Newark State College

Montclair State College

Articles describing the project

"More Than Meets the Eye"; "Is the Lollypop Tree a False Idol?"; "The Eyes Have It" -- Early Years (Magazine).

Two articles - Star Ledger (Newark).

Article - N.J. School Leader, January/February, 1973.

Four articles - Union Leader.

Written inquiries about project

65 from New Jersey

52 from out of state

COMMITMENT ACTIVITIES

Essential elements of the program:

Use of the prescribed instructional program at least three times per week for 10-15 minutes each time in kindergarten for Level I and in first grade for Level II. Use of Out of Sight game is optional and is considered reinforcement for the program. Adopter districts may use the program in higher grade levels.

The Teacher's Guides for the SEE lessons are written so that the materials are self sufficient and thus may be used without training or followup consultation. However, both training and followup consultation are available upon request from members of the SEE staff. In most cases a presentation to a school district is structured to be both an orientation and a brief training session. The time required for this is approximately 2-1/2 hours.

Orientation/training sessions were given to the following districts:

Clinton	Hackensack	Pompton Lakes (public & non public schools)
East Brunswick	Irvington	Spotswood
Englishtown-Manalapan	Linden	Union City
Fort Monmouth	Montville	West Caldwell
Gillette	Piscataway	

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

Number of kits distributed *	N.J.	Other States
Level I (Out of Sight game included)	117	11
Number of districts represented	40	11
Projected number of students in program based upon an average class size of 25	2,925	275

* Of the 117 kits distributed, 90 were purchased and 27 were given free of charge by the project director.

Student achievement results in consumer districts

Five New Jersey consumer districts volunteered to use the Knobler test series, 1-3, to pre and posttest their students in the SEE program. These districts were categorized roughly in the following way for purposes of comparing the program's results:

PreSchool	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Fort Monmouth Pre school Center 112 children, pretested 78 children, posttested	None	West Caldwell, 110 K children Manalapan-Englis-town 478 K children Pompton Lakes 158 K children	Lakehurst 34 K children

The children in West Caldwell received seven months of training. Those in the other districts received four to four and one-half months of training. All children in the originating district, Union, receive seven months of training. The test results are listed on the following page. Teachers who reported these results were trained by the project staff.

The test results show that children in West Caldwell achieved at the same level as those in Union after having received instruction for the same period of time. Children in consumer districts who received instruction for four to four and one-half months did not achieve at the level achieved in Union.

1972 - 1973 SUMMARY OF TEST DATA

LEVEL I - KDGN. & PRE SCHOOL

KNOBLER TESTS	PRE SCHOOL		SUBURBAN				RURAL		UNION	
	4 - 4-1/2 mo. training		7 mo. training		4 - 4-1/2 mo. training		4 - 4-1/2 mo. training		7 mo. training	
TEST SCORES	Pre-Test	Post-Test	West Caldwell Pre	West Caldwell Post	Other Pre	Other Post	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-test
K 1	16.027	19.784	16.191	23.513	20.45	24.144	20.293	25.157	16.694	23.45
K 2	12.802	17.344	14.746	20.930	15.293	21.461	16.470	21.157	14.681	20.923
K 3	12.355	16.123	14.347	21.296	16.443	20.955	17.617	22.533	14.739	21.284
	112 children	78 children								
DIFFERENTIALS										
K 1	3.757		7.322		3.685		4.807		6.756	
K 2	4.542		6.184		6.168		4.687		6.242	
K 3	3.768		6.949		4.512		5.0		6.905	
	78 Pre K children trained in Ft. Monmouth Pre School Center		110 K children trained in West Caldwell		478 K children trained in Manalapan-Englishtown 158 K children trained in Pompton Lakes		34 K children trained in Lakehurst, N.J.		412 K children	

Districts which purchased and/or were given kits

		#	Level
1.	Atco-Lower Camden County	4	I
2.	Calais School - Convent Station L.D.	1	I
3.	Clinton	3	I
4.	Cranford	1	I
5.	East Brunswick	10	I
6.	Edison	1	I
7.	Englishtown-Manalapan	12	I
8.	Fort Monmouth Pre School Center	5	I
9.	Freehold Twp.	1	I
10.	Holy Spirit	2	I
11.	Gillette	1	I
12.	Hackensack	1	I
13.	Hillside	3	I
14.	Irvington	12	I
15.	Lakehurst	2	I
16.	Linden	2	I
17.	Manasquan	1	I
18.	Monroe Twp.	2	I
19.	Montville	8	I
20.	Mt. Carmel Guild (Newark)	1	I
21.	Pennsgrove	2	I
22.	Piscataway	6	I
23.	Pompton Lakes	5	I
24.	Port Republic	1	I
25.	Princeton	1	I
26.	St. Mary's (Pompton Lakes)	1	I
27.	St. Michael's (Union)	2	I
28.	Scotch Plains	1	I
29.	Seabrook	1	I
30.	Short Hills	3	I
31.	Solomon Scheshter (Union)	1	I
32.	South Plainfield	1	I
33.	Spotswood	3	I
34.	Union City	3	I
35.	Wanaque	6	I
36.	Wayne	2	I
37.	West Caldwell	2	I
38.	Westfield	1	I
39.	Westlake Schools	1	I
40.	Westmont	1	I
		117	Level I

(Out of State)

1.	California	1	I
2.	Connecticut	2	I
3.	Florida	1	I
4.	Indiana	1	I
5.	Iowa	1	I
6.	Massachusetts	2	I
7.	New York	3	I
		11	Level I

COMMITMENT ACTIVITIES

Essential elements of the program:

Use of the prescribed instructional program at least three times per week for 10-15 minutes each time in kindergarten for Level I and in first grade for Level II. Use of Out of Sight game is optional and is considered reinforcement for the program. Adopter districts may use the program in higher grade levels.

The Teacher's Guides for the SEE lessons are written so that the materials are self sufficient and thus may be used without training or followup consultation. However, both training and followup consultation are available upon request from members of the SEE staff. In most cases a presentation to a school district is structured to be both an orientation and a brief training session. The time required for this is approximately 2-1/2 hours.

Orientation/training sessions were given to the following districts:

District	Number of persons
Brick Township	17
Clinton	25
Edison	19
Galloway Township	32
Hackensack	44
Hawthorne	10
Jackson	15
Linden	3
Linden (training session)	10
Newark (Avon Avenue School)	10
New Brunswick	15
Nutley	30
Piscataway	26
Piscataway (training session)	12
Pompton Lakes	15
Short Hills Country Day School	10
Somerville	17
Somerville (training session)	20
Summit	10
Union City	15
Washington Township	15
West Caldwell	7
Woodbridge	35

The Project SEE staff went to Hackensack to observe the program in use and provide consultation.

DISSEMINATION IMPACT:

Number of kits purchased	N.J.	Other States
Level I	119	14
Level II	58	7
Tactuals	4	0
Number of districts represented	68	12
Projected number of students in program based upon an average class size of 25	4,425	525

Achievement results in consumer districts

New Jersey consumer districts volunteered to use the Knobler test series, 1-3, to pre and posttest their students in the SEE program. These districts were categorized roughly in the following way for purposes of comparing the program's results:

PreSchool	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Monmouth Preschool Center, 70 children	Union City Level I, 192 children, K Level II, 54 children, 2nd gr. (Spanish speaking population)	Wanaque, Fords, Pompton Lakes Level I, 246 children, K Pompton Lakes, Level II, 34 children, 1st gr. West Caldwell, Level II, 52 children, 1st. gr.	Williamstown, Level I, 41 children, K

Some of the teachers who submitted the test results were trained by the SEE staff; others were not. Test results indicate that some students in consumer districts classified as suburban and rural did achieve at levels comparable to those in Union. Students in the urban consumer district made gains but not comparable to those of students in Union. At this writing we do not have data on the length of time students in these consumer districts received instruction in the program.

SUMMARY OF DISSEMINATION REPORT: 1973-74 BUDGET: $44,214

MATERIALS PREPARED AND PRINTED

Level I Instructional Kit	250	copies
Out of Sight Game, Level I	250	copies
Level II, Instructional Kit	250	copies
Out of Sight Game, Level II	250	copies
Tactuals Kit	30	copies

Materials Sold

Item	Cost	Number sold	Amt. received
Level I Instructional Kit (Out of Sight game included)	$15 for N.J. $25 for out of state	133	
Level II Instructional Kit (Out of Sight game included)	$15 for N.J. $25 for out of state	75	
Tactuals	$15	4	

TOTAL: $2,188.72

AWARENESS AND INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Visitors to project 75

Approximately 6 introductory presentations to approximately 400 persons.

Professional Meetings	Attendance
Art Educators of New Jersey (2 presentations)	100
Educational Improvement Center-Northwest (2 presentations)	50
N.J.E.A. Convention, Atlantic City (this number does not include the many people who were given information at the project booth)	100
Hunterdon County Educators	40
N.J.E.A. New Ideas Conference, Monmouth College (2 presentations)	75

1973-74 Summary of test data

Adopter Districts

SUMMARY OF SAMPLING OF TEST DATA

Test	Pre-School		Urban	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
LEVEL I				
K1	17.078	19.732	13.085	17.165
K2	12.13	16.82	11.554	16.809
K3	12.636	16.976	11.204	18.108
LEVEL II				
K1			21.71	24.760
K2			18.517	22.173
K3			17.335	18.594
DIFFERENTIALS				
LEVEL I				
K 1	2.654		4.08	
K 2	4.69		5.255	
K 3	4.34		6.904	
LEVEL II				
K 1			3.05	
K 2			3.565	
K 3			1.259	

70 Pre K children tested in Monmouth PreSchool Center

192 K children tested in Level I in Union City

54 2nd grade children tested in Level II in Union City

(Spanish speaking population)

1973-74 Summary of test data

Adopter Districts

Suburban		Rural		Union	
Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
17.917	24.408	18.0	26.09	16.694	23.45
15.216	24.408	14.56	22.95	14.681	20.923
15.227	22.304	13.56	23.54	14.379	21.284
18.927	23.521			17.730	24.351
13.235	22.545			14.881	22.146
12.155	20.357			11.529	19.404
6.491		8.9		6.756	
5.949		8.39		6.242	
7.007		9.98		6.905	
4.594				6.621	
9.31				7.265	
8.202				7.875	

246 K children tested in Level I in Wanaque, Fords, Pompton Lakes

34 1st grade children tested in Level II in Pompton Lakes

52 1st grade children tested in Level II in West Caldwell

41 K children tested in Level I in Williamstown

Districts which purchased kits

		#	Level I	Level II	Tactuals
1.	Atco - Lower Camden County	1	X		
2.	Bethlehem Twp.	1	X		
3.	Boonton	2	X		
4.	Bordentown	1	X		
5.	Bricktown	5	X		
		2		X	
6.	Chatham	2	X		
		2		X	
7.	Clinton	1	X		
		1		X	
8.	Deal	1	X		
		1		X	
9.	East Brunswick	2		X	
10.	Edison Twp.	4	X		
11.	Elmwood Park	1	X		
12.	Flemington	2	X		
		2		X	
13.	Garfield	1	X		
14.	Hackensack	5	X		
		2		X	
		2			X
15.	Hackettstown	1	X		
16.	Harding Twp.	4	X		
17.	Holy Spirit (Union)	1		X	
18.	Hopelawn	1	X		
		1		X	
19.	Hunterdon State School	1	X		
		1		X	
20.	Irvington	2		X	
21.	Jackson	5	X		
		1		X	
22.	Kinnelon	1	X		
23.	Madison	2	X		
24.	Lebanon	1	X		
		1		X	
25.	Liberty	1	X		
		1		X	
26.	Maple Shade	1	X		
		1		X	
27.	Matawan	1	X		
28.	Maywood	1	X		
29.	Mendham	2	X		
		2		X	
30.	Milford	1	X		
31.	Montgomery Twp.	1	X		
32.	Montvale	4	X		
33.	Montville	4	X		
		3		X	
34.	Neptune	1	X		
		1		X	
35.	Newark (Right to Read)	12	X		
		12		X	

Districts which purchased kits (cont'd.)

		#	Level I	Level II	Tactuals
36.	Newark (Classroom)	1	X		
37.	North Caldwell	1	X		
38.	North Jersey Training	1	X		
39.	Nutley	3	X		
		1		X	
40.	Orange	2	X		
41.	Pine Beach	1	X		
42.	Piscataway	5	X		
		1		X	
43.	Plainfield	1	X		
44.	Pompton Lakes	4		X	
		2			X
45.	Ramsey	1	X		
46.	Ringoes	2	X		
47.	Ringwood	1	X		
48.	Rivervale	1	X		
49.	St. Mary's (Pompton Lakes)	1	X		
50.	St. Michael's (Union)	1		X	
51.	Short Hills	2		X	
52.	Solomon Schechter (Union)	1		X	
53.	Somers Point	1		X	
		1			X
54.	Somerset Day Care Center	1			X
55.	Sparta (Montessori)	1	X		
56.	Spring Lake	1	X		
57.	Stockton	1	X		
58.	Summit	2	X		
59.	Toms River	1	X		
60.	Trenton	1		X	
61.	Union City	5	X		
		2		X	
62.	West Caldwell	3		X	
63.	Warren	1	X		
		1		X	
64.	Washington Twp.	3	X		
65.	Wayne	2	X		
		1		X	
66.	West Milford	1	X		
67.	Whippany	1	X		
68.	Woodbridge-Twp. (Colonia-Fords-Iselin-Woodbridge)	5	X		
69.	Short Hills - Pingry (private	1	X		
			119	58	4

Districts which purchased kits (cont'd.)	#	Level I	Level II	Tactuals
(Out of State)				
1. Alabama	1	X		
	1		X	
2. California	1	X		
	2		X	
3. Colorado	1	X		
4. Maryland	1	X		
5. Massachusetts	1	X		
6. Minnesota	3	X		
Missouri	1	X		
	1	X		
New York	1	X		
	2		X	
Texas	1	X		
	1		X	
Washington	1	X		
Wisconsin	1	X		
		14	7	